THIS BOOK is the third edition of Dr. Ghurye's famous work *Caste and Race in India*, published in 1932 in the History of Civilization Series. The history of the ancient and mediæval forms of the institution of caste as told in that book has now become generally accepted. The analysis of the then recent and contemporary trends in caste, which was not palatable to many because of its frankness, has been proved by later events to be too true. The viewpoint that caste is only an exaggerated aspect of class, set out in the book almost for the first time, has become current among sociologists. As a study in privileged grouping the book has an international appeal. In view of the truth of the author's previous diagnosis and prognosis of this institution his analysis and exhortation embodied in the fresh chapter on Scheduled Castes and the last one on Class must command respectful attention.

This new edition also includes an up-to-date chapter on Race which was dropped in the earlier one.

SHOUT
SHARE
IT

CASTE AND CLASS IN INDIA

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

Aborigines, so-called, and their Future
Culture and Society

Occidental Civilization
Indian Costume

Race Relations in Negro-Africa
Indian Sadhus

Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture

Sexual Behaviour of the American Female

Caste And Class In India

DS
422
C3
G5

G. S. GHURYE

Professor and Head of the Dept. of Sociology,
University of Bombay

1957

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT BOMBAY

First published as
Caste and Race in India in 1932

Caste and Class in India

First Published 1950

Second Edition 1957

Printed by G. G. Pathare, at the Popular Press (Bom.) Private Ltd., 29, Tardeo Road, Bombay 7, and published by G. R. Bhatkal for the Popular Book Depot, Lamington Road, Bombay 7

Dedicated

to the

Alma Mater,

The University of Bombay,

on her

Centenary.

——:o:——

3-1-1957

PREFACE

In this edition of my book I have reinstated the chapter on Race which I had dropped out from the last edition. Teachers of the subject represented to me that the deletion of that chapter was felt by them and their students to be a great handicap in the study of caste. I have therefore brought it up-to-date and included it in this edition. In keeping with the new political and social set-up—I must point out that at the time of the last edition, the Constitution of India was not framed or published—I have added a much-needed chapter on Scheduled Castes. In other places I have only added here and there some of the evidence that I thought to be absolutely indispensable; otherwise I have kept the book as it was. I hope readers of my book will find these changes of advantage to them.

G. S. GHURYE

University Department of Sociology,
Bombay,
12-12-1956.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

In 1921 when studying at Cambridge I chose caste as the subject of my research. Previously, while living in London for some time I had thought of combining the study of caste with that of class. The decision I took at Cambridge was the result of my preliminary study of the racial aspect of caste. It was by itself intricate enough to occupy me for the best part of two years which I could afford at Cambridge. At that time I could hardly dream of anyone approaching a similar avenue of study. But subsequent events showed that Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis was studying Bengal caste from a similar point of view. The results of my inquiry were accepted as one of the papers for the Ph.D. degree by the Cambridge University in the first quarter of 1923. The paper "Ethnic Theory of Caste" after some delay was published in *Man in India* in 1924. Before I left Cambridge in April 1923 I had signed a contract with Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co. for a book *Caste and Race in India* to be included in their series entitled History of Civilization, edited by C. K. Ogden. I had already prepared a tentative plan of not only the racial aspect but also the other aspects of caste and its historical setting. When at Bombay I sat down to it in 1924 I added to it as a natural conclusion the plan of analysis of contemporary trends. The final type-script of the book was despatched to the London publishers early in 1931 and the book was published by them in London in the beginning of 1932.

Between the time my type-script of *Caste and Race in India* left me and its publication in the book-form a number of papers and books appeared here in India in quick succession, demonstrating the fact that the subject of caste was in the air. The Report on the Indian Census of 1931 was published after my book but the anthropometric survey undertaken in connection with the Census was rather slow to appear. The Census Report contained Dr. Hutton's contribution to caste. The anthropometric survey when published,

created a little confusion in the beginning. Later on its grave defects were pointed out by me.

My book, as extracts of some of the reviews so insistently printed by the present publishers will show, was almost universally well received. It went out of print some years back, when owing to other pre-occupations I could not direct immediate attention to its revision. When I was almost free to do so I found that Dr. Hutton had forestalled me with his book *Caste in India*. Naturally I waited for some time.

During the interval of nearly twenty years from the time when the manuscript of *Caste and Race in India* was ready and the actual revision of it, the subject of caste as an extreme case of social stratification has assumed a significance which was realized by me but was not common heritage of sociologists. The European institution of class, too, has come in for a more detailed and analytical treatment. A number of investigations to measure its strength, to unravel its precise nature, were made, more in the U.S.A. than in the U.K. The Marxian doctrine of class-war, since the success of the Russian Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet Regime, turned the attention of not only professional students but wise statesmen to the understanding of class structure. In the United States the Negro problem worried and worries a number of sociologists and statesmen. Its apparent affiliation to caste has naturally turned American attention to the study of caste. Racial differentiation brought to the forefront by the Nazis in Germany further oriented the subject. The result is seen in the much fuller treatment of class and caste in the recent edition of the best of English text-books of Sociology, Prof. R. M. MacIver's *Society*, which he has brought out in collaboration with Page. A little earlier Cox wrote a whole volume, which for the first time brought the three aspect of social differentiation, caste, class and race, together under one title.

The importance of the study of social differentiation only adds its weight to my viewpoint. In the new set-up, national

and international, it was natural that class society should be more prominently associated with caste society and public attention should be specifically drawn to the developing transformation and to the dangers to be avoided. To achieve this end a new chapter entitled "Class, its Role" is added and the book is named *Caste and Class in India*. As for the rest, only slight alterations have been made. They incorporate additional evidence of the original viewpoint come to hand during twenty years' reading and thinking.

Khar,
Bombay 21.
30th June '50.

G. S. GHURYE

PREFACE TO
CASTE AND RACE IN INDIA
(Published in 1932 in the History of Civilization Series)

In the following pages I have made an attempt to give my views on the history and the origin of the caste-system as it was in the past and is today among the Hindus of India. As regards caste in recent and contemporary times, I have purposely restricted the treatment to the institution as it is found among the Hindus. Whatever elements of caste happen to occur among the other communities of India are derivative, and as such do not serve to illuminate the problem of caste. While writing about an institution which has been studied by scholars for over half a century, one receives intellectual stimulation on its many aspects from various authors. One's obligations to them are too indirect and indefinite to be mentioned in specific references. And when such references are made, they often do not measure the scope of one's obligations. In the present book I find myself in this situation with respect to some writers on the subject of caste, notably J. C. Nesfield, Professor E. W. Hopkins, E. Senart, Sir H. H. Risley and Dr. S. V. Ketkar. I have derived great benefit from their works, for which my sincere thanks are due to them.

Many of my friends have done me the honour of contributing something or other in connection with this work. Professor A. S. Altekar of Benares has read in manuscript the third and fourth chapters, and has made some useful suggestions. Mr. S. R. Deshpande of Bombay has particularly helped me in reading the proofs and making a few corrections Professor D. R. Gadgil of Poona has read the whole manuscript, and enabled me to improve it very much by his penetrating criticisms. Dr. E. J. Thomas of Cambridge has helped me to avoid many pitfalls, and to insert the diacritical marks, so essential for proper pronunciation. To all of them I am grateful for their ready and generous help.

G. S. Ghurye

CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		vii
Preface to the 1st Edition		ix
Preface to *Caste and Race in India*		xiii
CHAPTER 1	Features of the Caste System	1
CHAPTER 2	Nature of Caste Groups	31
CHAPTER 3	Caste through the Ages	43
CHAPTER 4	Caste through the Ages (II)	76
CHAPTER 5	Race and Caste	116
CHAPTER 6	Elements of Caste outside India	143
CHAPTER 7	Origins of Caste System	165
CHAPTER 8	Caste and British Rule	184
CHAPTER 9	Caste and Nationalism	220
CHAPTER 10	Scheduled Castes	240
CHAPTER 11	Class and Its Role	268
Appendices A to G		290
Bibliographical Abbreviations		297
Index		303

"Disinterested intellectual curiosity is the life-blood of real civilization. Social history provides one of its best forms."

G. M. TREVELYAN: *English Social History, VIII*

1

Features of the Caste System

A foreign visitor to India is struck by the phenomenon known as the caste system. He may not understand the full working of the system, but he is aware of the fact that Hindu society is divided into groups, known as castes, with varying degrees of respectability and circles of social intercourse. Baines observes: "It needs but a very short time in the country to bring home to the most casual observer the ubiquity of the institution, and to make him acquainted with some of the principal exoteric features."[1] This is due not only to the fact that caste is the most general form of social organization in India but also because it presents such a marked contrast to the social grouping prevalent in Europe or America. Owing to these two features—ubiquity and strangeness—the institution has found many able scholars devoted to its study. With all the labours of these students, however, we do not possess a real general definition of caste. It appears to me that any attempt at definition is bound to fail because of the complexity of the phenomenon. On the other hand, much literature on the subject is marred by lack of precision about the use of the term. Hence I propose to give a description of the factors underlying this system of castes.

The earliest account of this institution, given by a foreigner of the third century B.C., mentions two of the features characterizing it before it was modified by the close cultural contact with Western Europe during the last century. "It is not permitted to contract marriage with a person of another caste, nor to change from one profession or trade to another, nor for the same person to undertake more than one, except he is of the caste of philosophers, when permission is given on account of his dignity."[2] Though this statement of Megasthenes brings two of the most salient features of the

institution to the forefront, yet it fails to give a complete idea of the system.

The outstanding features of Hindu society when it was ruled by the social philosophy of caste, unaffected by the modern ideas of rights and duties, may be discerned to be six.

(1) Segmental Division of Society:—This caste-society was not a more or less homogeneous community in which, whatever distinctions of social status may exist, they are so much in the background that a special inquiry has to be made in order to realize their presence, but a society in which various groups with distinct appellations were prominent. Castes were groups with a well-developed life of their own, the membership whereof, unlike that of voluntary associations and of classes, was determined not by selection but by birth. The status of a person depended not on his wealth as in the classes of modern Europe, but on the traditional importance of the caste in which he had the luck of being born. On the distinction between caste and class, as far only as cleavage into well-marked groups is concerned, MacIver observes: "Whereas in eastern civilizations the chief determinant of a class and status was birth, in the western civilization of today wealth is a class-determinant of equal or perhaps greater importance, and wealth is a less rigid determinant than birth: it is more concrete, and thus its claims are more easily challenged; itself a matter of degree, it is less apt to create distinctions of kind, alienable, acquirable, and transferable, it draws no such permanent lines of cleavage as does birth."[3] To restrict myself to the Marathi-region, a person is born either a Brahmin, Prabhu, Maratha, Vani, Sonar, Sutar, Bhandari, Chambhar, or a Mahar, etc. If he chances to take a vocation which is not earmarked for a particular caste—say the military—he remains a casteman all the same. A Brahmin general and a Maratha general, though of equal status in the army, belong to two different status-groups in their private life and there could not be any social intercourse between them on equal terms. But this is not the case in a class-society where status is determined by vocation and consequent income. A class has

no council, standing or occasional, to regulate the conduct and guide the morals of its members, apart from the laws of the community as a whole. Members of one class follow different vocations, which, when organized, possess standing executive committees, which govern the members of their profession according to their rules. These rules generally exclude the legitimate province of the wider community, and refer only to professional etiquette or economic gain. "In the case of the brain-working profession, these common rules and this authoritative direction seek to prescribe such matters as the qualifications for entry, the character of the training, the methods of remuneration, the conditions of employment, the rules of behaviour towards fellow professionals and the public, the qualifications and methods of selection for public appointments, and the terms of service, the maintenance of the status of the profession, and the power of expulsion."[4] Most of the castes on the other hand, excepting the high ones like the Brahmin[5] and the Rajput, have regular standing councils deciding on many more matters than those taken cognizance of by the committees of the trade unions, associations, or guilds, and thus encroaching on the province of the whole community. How the Brahmin and other high castes managed their affairs is not quite clear, but in the case of the Brahmins of Southern India at least, it seems from an epigraphic record that as occasion arose they used to call a special meeting of the members of the caste.[6] The assembly could get its decree executed by the king's officials. The governing body of a caste is called the Panchayat. Some of the offences dealt with by it are: (a) eating, drinking, or having similar dealings with a caste or sub-caste, with which such social intercourse is held to be forbidden; (b) keeping as concubine a woman of another caste; (c) seduction of or adultery with a married woman; (d) fornication; (e) refusal to fulfil a promise of marriage; (f) refusing to send a wife to her husband when old enough; (g) refusing to maintain a wife; (h) non-payment of debt; (i) petty assaults; (j) breaches of the customs of the trade peculiar to the caste; (k) encroaching on another's clientele, and raising or lowering prices; (l) killing a cow or any other forbidden animal; (m) insulting a Brahmin; (n) defying the

customs of the caste regarding feasts, etc., during marriage and other ceremonies.[7] It will be seen from this list that some of the offences tried by the governing bodies of castes were such as are usually dealt with by the State in its judicial capacity. Thus, a caste was a group with a separate arrangement for meting out justice to its members apart from that of the community as a whole, within which the caste was included as only one of the groups. Hence the members of a caste ceased to be members of the community as a whole, as far as that part of their morals which is regulated by law was concerned.[8] This quasi-sovereignty of the caste is particularly brought to notice by the fact that the caste council was prepared to re-try criminal offences decided by the courts of law.[9] This means that in this caste-bound society the amount of community-feeling must have been restricted, and that the citizens owed moral allegiance to their caste first, rather than to the community as a whole. By segmental division I wish to connote this aspect of the system. The punishments that these councils awarded were: (1) out-casting, either temporary or permanent; (2) fines; (3) feasts to be given to the castemen; (4) corporal punishment, and (5) sometimes religious expiation. The proceeds of the fines were generally spent on a common feast. Sometimes the perquisites of the Panchayat were bought out of them and sometimes again they were devoted to charitable purposes.[10] This description of the activities of a caste-council will enable us to appreciate the remark, "The caste is its own ruler."[11] The diversity in the administration of law necessarily led to differences in moral standards of the various castes. There was thus created a cultural gulf between the castes. I may note some of the items of cultural differences among the castes to bring out clearly the implications of the segmentation. Many of the castes have their special deities. Among such castes the following may be noted from Southern India: Komāti, Kamsala, Gamalla, Idiga, Māla, and Mādiga[12]; from the Central Provinces, Ahir[13]; from the United Provinces: Aheriya, Bahaliya, Kharwār, Korwā, Chero, Bhuiyār, Dom, Musāhār, and Nāi[14]; and from Gujarat, Vaishyas.[15] About the differences in religious outlook of the Madras castes it has been said:

"Amongst the Brahmin community this one fact stands off clear and distinct, that they do not indulge in the worship of Grāma Devatā, the village gods, to which the aboriginal population almost exclusively bows down."[16] The customs about marriage and death vary widely among the different castes. Brahmins did not permit widow-marriage nor tolerate concubinage as a caste-practice. This could not be said of many lower castes. Not only were there such differences in cultural matters among the different castes, but in theory also different standards of conduct were upheld. Thus the Brahmin Government of Poona, while passing some legislation prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquors, excluded the Bhandaris, Kolis and similar other castes from the operation thereof, but strictly forbade the use of drink to 'Brahmins, Shenvis, Parbhus and Government officers'.[17] These differences of morals and customs were so manifest that the early British Courts in India not merely asked the opinion of their pundits, but took the evidence of the heads of the castes concerned as to their actual usages. The collection of laws and customs of Hindu castes, made by Steele under the orders of Government, was intended to help the courts to ascertain the diverse customs. The Hindus have no standing arrangements for the disposal of their dead. When any person dies it is the caste-fellows who are to be invited to carry the corpse to the cremation-ground and to dispose of it. At the time of marriage a feast has, by common consent, to be given to all the members of one's own caste resident in the village or the town. At the preparation of these feasts as well as in connection with other items of the marriage ceremony it is again the caste-people who run to one's help. These and similar affairs of everyday life require the co-operation of one's caste-people. Hence castes are small and complete social worlds in themselves, marked off definitely from one another, though subsisting within the larger society.

(2) Hierarchy:—In my discussion of the subject so far I have used the comparative degree with reference to the status of different castes, thus assuming beforehand one of the principal characteristics of the caste society, viz. the hierarchy

of the groups. Everywhere in India there is a definite scheme of social precedence amongst the castes, with the Brahmin as the head of the hierarchy. Only in Southern India the artisan castes "have always maintained a struggle for a higher place in the social scale than that allowed to them by Brahmanical authority. . . . There is no doubt as to the fact that the members of this great caste [Kammalan] dispute the supremacy of the Brahmins, and that they hold themselves to be equal in rank with them." John Fryer, who visited India in 1670, seems to refer to this attitude.[18] In any one of the linguistic divisions of India there are as many as two hundred castes which can be grouped in classes whose gradation is largely acknowledged by all. But the order of social precedence amongst the individual castes of any class cannot be made definite, because not only is there no ungrudging acceptance of such rank but also the ideas of the people on this point are very nebulous and uncertain. The following observations vividly bring out this state of things. "As the society now stands . . . the place due to each community is not easily distinguishable, nor is any common principle of precedence recognized by the people themselves by which to grade the castes. Excepting the Brahmin at one end and the admittedly degraded castes like the Holeyas at the other, the members of a large proportion of the intermediate castes think or profess to think that their caste is better than their neighbours' and should be ranked accordingly."[19] Martin remarks about Bihar that the Sudras there were usually divided into four classes, but adds: "The people, who assisted me in making up this account, could not with certainty refer each caste to its class; for they never had bestowed pains to enquire concerning the various claims of such low persons."[20]

(3) Restrictions on feeding and social intercourse:—There are minute rules as to what sort of food or drink can be accepted by a person and from what castes. But there is very great diversity in this matter. The practices in the matter of food and social intercourse divide India into two broad belts. In Hindustan proper, castes can be divided into five groups; first, the twice-born castes; second, those castes at

whose hands the twice-born can take "Pakkā" food; third, those castes at whose hands the twice-born cannot accept any kind of food but may take water; fourth, castes that are not untouchable yet are such that water from them cannot be used by the twice-born; last come all those castes whose touch defiles not only the twice-born but any orthodox Hindu.[21] All food is divided into two classes, "Kachchā" and "Pakkā", the former being any food in the cooking of which water has been used, and the latter all food cooked in "ghee" without the addition of water. "As a rule a man will never eat 'Kachchā' food unless it is prepared by a fellow caste-man, which in actual practice means a member of his own endogamous group, whether it be caste or sub-caste, or else by his Brahmin 'Guru' or spiritual guide."[22] But in practice most castes seem to take no objection to "Kachchā" food from a Brahmin.[23] A Brahmin can accept "Kachchā" food at the hands of no other caste; nay, some of them, like the Kanaujia Brahmins, are so punctilious about these restrictions that, as a proverb has it, three Kanaujias require no less than thirteen hearths.[24] As for the "Pakkā" food, it may be taken by a Brahmin at the hands of some of the castes only.[25] A man of higher caste cannot accept "Kachchā" food from one of the lower, though the latter may regale himself with similar food offered by a member of one of the castes accepted to be higher than his own.

The ideas about the power of certain castes to convey pollution by touch are not so highly developed in Northern India as in the South. The idea that impurity can be transmitted by the mere shadow of an untouchable or by his approaching within a certain distance does not seem to prevail in Hindustan. No Hindu of decent caste would touch a Chamār, or a Dom; and some of the very low castes themselves are quite strict about contact. Thus "The Bansphor and Basor, themselves branches of the Dom caste, will touch neither a Dom, nor a Dhobi, whilst the Basor, with all the intolerance of the parvenu, extends his objections to the Musāhār, Chamār, Dharkār and Bhangi."[26]

In Bengal the castes are divided into two main groups: (1) the Brahmins, and (2) the Śūdras. The second class is further divided into four sub-classes, indicating their status as regards food and water: (a) the Sat-Śūdra group includes such castes as the Kāyasth and the Nabaśākh; (b) then come the Jalācharanīya-Śūdras, "being those castes, not technically belonging to the Nabaśākh group, from whom Brahmins and members of the higher castes can take water"; (c) then follow the Jalābyabahārya-Śūdras, castes from whose hands a Brahmin cannot take water; (d) last stand the Aśprisya-Śūdras, castes whose touch is so impure as to pollute even the Ganges water, and hence their contact must be avoided. They are thus the untouchables.[27] In the matter of food Western Bengal resembles Hindustan except in this that in Bengal there are some people who will not accept any "Kachchā" food even from the hands of a Brahmin. "Pakkā" food can be ordinarily taken not only from one's own or any higher caste, but also from the confectioner class, the Myras and Halwais.[28] As regards the position of the untouchables the following observation will give a clear idea. "Even wells are polluted if a low caste man draws water from them, but a great deal depends on the character of the vessel used and of the well from which water is drawn. A masonry well is not so easily defiled as one constructed with clay pipes, and if it exceeds three and a half cubits in width so that a cow may turn round in it, it can be used even by the lowest castes without defilement. . . . " Certain low castes are looked down upon as so unclean that they may not enter the courtyard of the great temples. These castes are compelled to live by themselves on the outskirts of villages.[29]

In Eastern and Southern Bengal[30] and in Gujarat and the whole of Southern India there is no distinction of food as "Kachchā" for the purposes of its acceptance or otherwise from anyone but a member of one's own caste. In Gujarat[31] and Southern India, generally speaking a Brahmin never thinks of accepting water, much less any cooked food, from any caste but that of the Brahmins, and all the other castes or groups of castes more or less follow the principle of accepting no

cooked food from any caste that stands lower than itself in the social scale. This rule does not apply with the same strictness to accepting water. Again as a rule, a lower caste has no scruples in accepting cooked food from any higher caste. Thus all the castes will take cooked food from the Brahmin.

The theory of pollution being communicated by some castes to members of the higher ones is also here more developed. Theoretically, the touch of a member of any caste lower than one's own defiles a person of the higher caste; but in actual practice this rule is not strictly observed. In the Maratha country the shadow of an untouchable is sufficient, if it falls on a member of a higher caste, to pollute him. In Madras, and especially in Malabar, this doctrine is still further elaborated, so that certain castes have always to keep a stated distance between themselves and the Brahmin and other higher castes so as not to defile the latter. Thus the Shānār, toddy-tapper of Tamilnad, contaminates a Brahmin if he approaches the latter within twenty-four paces.[32] Among the people of Kerala, a Nāyar may approach a Nambudiri Brahmin but must not touch him; while a Tiyan must keep himself at the distance of thirty-six steps from the Brahmin, and a Pulayan may not approach him within ninety-six paces. A Tiyan must keep away from a Nāyar at twelve paces, while some castes may approach the Tiyan, though they must not touch him. A Pulayan must not come near any of the Hindu castes. So rigid are the rules about defilement which is supposed to be carried with them by all except the Brahmins, that the latter will not perform even their ablutions within the precincts of a Śūdra's habitation.[33] Generally the washerman and the barber that serve the general body of villagers, will not render their services to the unclean and untouchable castes. "Even a modern Brahmin doctor, when feeling the pulse of a Śūdra, first wraps up the patient's wrist with a small piece of silk so that he may not be defiled by touching his skin."[34]

(4) Civil and Religious disabilities and privileges of the different sections:—Segregation of individual castes or of

groups of castes in a village is the most obvious mark of civil privileges and disabilities, and it has prevailed in a more or less definite form all over India. Southern India, as in the matter of ceremonial purity and untouchability, stands out distinct in the rigidity of these rules. In Northern India generally, in the Maratha country and, as it appears, sometimes in the Telugu and Canarese regions, it is only the impure castes that are segregated and made to live on the outskirts of villages. It does not seem that other groups of castes have distinct quarters of the town or village allotted to them excepting in parts of Gujarat. In the Tamil and Malayalam regions very frequently different quarters are occupied by separate castes or sometimes the village is divided into three parts: that occupied by the dominant caste in the village or by the Brahmins, that allotted to the Śūdras, and the one reserved for the Panchamas or untouchables. In a village of the Ramnad District, the main portion is occupied by the Nayakars, shepherds, artisans, washermen, and barbers, forming a group living in the northeast corner of the village, while the untouchables ply their trades in the north-west and the south-east corners.[35] In Trichinopoly district the villages have the houses arranged in streets. "The Brahmin, Shudra and Panchama quarters are separate, and in the last of these the Pallans, Paraiyans and Chakkiliyans live in separate streets."[36] In Madras, Pallis or agriculturists live in separate quarters "distinctively known as the Palli teru".[37] Sometimes, as in the district of Bellary, it is only the untouchable, like the Madiga, that is singled out for segregation, all other castes living in close proximity to one another.[38] In some parts of the Maratha country castes have been allotted distinct quarters of the village called by the name of the caste: Brahmin-ali, or wada, Prabhu-ali, Sonar-ali, etc. The depressed classes, like the Mang, Mahar, etc., are forced to live on the outskirts of the village.[39]

In Southern India certain parts of the town or village are inaccessible to certain castes. The agitation by the impure castes to gain free access to certain streets in Vaikam in Travancore brings into clear relief some of the disabilities of

these castes. It is recorded that under the rule of the Marathas and the Peshwas, the Mahars and Mangs were not allowed within the gates of Poona between 3 p.m. and 9 a.m. because before nine and after three their bodies cast too long a shadow, which falling on a member of the higher castes—especially Brahmin—defiles him.[40] However, in the Dravidian south, the very land of the supreme dominance of the Brahmin, the Brahmin was restricted in his rights of access to any part of the village. It is well known that in a village which is a gift to the Brahmins, a Paraiyan is not allowed to enter the Brahmin quarter; but it is not known to many students that the Paraiyans will not permit a Brahmin to pass through their street; so much so that if one happens to enter their quarters they would greet him with cow-dung water. "Brahmins in Mysore consider that great luck will await them if they can manage to pass through the Holeya (untouchables) quarter of a village unmolested."[41] All over India the impure castes are debarred from drawing water from the village well, which is used by the members of other castes. In the Maratha country a Mahar—one of the untouchables—might not spit on the road lest a pure-caste Hindu should be polluted by touching it with his foot, but had to carry an earthen pot, hung from his neck, in which to spit. Further he had to drag a thorny branch with him to wipe out his footprints and to lie at a distance prostrate on the ground if a Brahmin passed by, so that his foul shadow might not defile the holy Brahmin.[42] In the Panjab, where restrictions regarding pollution by proximity have been far less stringent than in other parts of India, a sweeper, while walking through the streets of the larger towns, was supposed to carry a broom in his hand or under his armpit as a mark of his being a scavenger and had to shout out to the people warning them of his polluting presence.[43] The schools, maintained at public cost, are practically closed to such impure castes as the Chamars and Mahars. "Both teachers and pupils in the schools make it most difficult for low-caste boys to sit in the class-rooms".[44] In Gujarat the depressed castes used to wear a horn as their distinguishing mark.[45] From certain decisions noted by the Peshwas in their diaries one can form some idea about the

disabilities of some of the castes in the Maratha country. The rulers upheld the claim of the potters, opposed by the carpenters, that they could lead their bridal processions on horseback, and that of the copper-smiths, against the Lingayats, to go in procession through public streets.[46]

In Dravidian India the disabilities of the lower castes went so far as to prescribe what sort of houses they should build and what material they might employ in the construction thereof. The Shanars and Izhavas, toddy-tappers of the eastern and the western coasts, were not allowed to build houses above one storey in height.[47] In Malabar the house is called by different names according to the occupant's caste; and peoples of inferior castes dare not refer to their own homes in the presence of Nambudiri Brahmin in more flattering terms than as "dung-heaps".[48]

The toddy-tappers of Malabar and the east coast, Izhavas and Shanars, were not allowed to carry umbrellas, to wear shoes or golden ornaments, to milk cows or even to use the ordinary language of the country.[49] In Malabar, Brahmins alone were permitted to sit on boards formed in the shape of a tortoise, and if a member of any other caste were to use such a seat he was liable to capital punishment.[50] Members of all castes, except the Brahmins, were expressly forbidden to cover the upper part of their body above the waist.[51] In the case of women also, until 1865 they were obliged by law to go with the upper part of their bodies quite bare, if they belonged to the Tiyan or other lower castes.[52] Under the Peshwas a greater distinction was made in the punishment on account of the caste of the criminal than of the nature of the crime itself. Hard labour and death were punishments mostly visited on criminals of the lower castes.[53]

In Tamilnad there has been for ages a faction among the non-Brahmin castes dividing most of them into two groups, the right-hand castes and the left-hand castes. The "right-hand" castes claim certain privileges which they strongly refuse to those of the "left-hand", viz. riding on horse-back

in processions, carrying standards with certain devices, and supporting their marriage booths on twelve pillars. They insist that the "left-hand" castes must not raise more than eleven pillars to the booth nor employ on their standards devices peculiar to the "right-hand" castes.[54]

Brahmanic ceremonies are to be performed with the help of a ritual, and two types of rituals have been evolved; the Vedic and the Puranic. The Vedic ritual is based on the Vedic mantras and is regarded as of great sanctity, while the Puranic is based on formulae of less sanctity, and not on revealed knowledge. How great this feeling of sanctity about Vedic lore was can be gauged from the fact that in 1843 a Brahmin professor advised the Bombay Board of Education not to publish a certain book because it contained quotations from Panini's grammar which, if printed, would be desecrated.[55] The Sudras are asked to content themselves with the latter ritual, while for the impure castes, a Brahmin, unless he is a pseudo-Brahmin or an apostate, would not minister at all. During the career of Sawai Madhavrao, the Peshwa's government had decreed that the Mahars, being *atiśūdras,* 'beyond Śūdras', could not have their marriage rites conducted by the regular Brahmin priests. They were asked to content themselves with the services of their castemen-priests, the Medhe-Mahārs.[56] It is only from the hands of the clean Śūdras, again, that a Brahmin will accept any gifts which are meant to store up merit for the donor. Such an advanced caste as the Prabhus in the Maratha country had to establish its right of carrying on the sacred rites according to the Vedic formulae which was being questioned during the period of the later Peshwas.[57] Certain sacraments cannot be performed by any other caste than the Brahmins. The most sacred literature cannot be studied by the Sudras. No caste can employ any other priests than the Brahmins, with very few exceptions, in Southern India. The artisans of Madras seem to employ their own priests; and the gold-smith caste of the Maratha region established their right of employing their caste-fellows as priests during the last part of the Peshwa-rule.[58] The inner-most recesses of temples can only be approached by the

Brahmins, clean Śūdras and other high castes having to keep outside the sacred precincts. The impure castes, and particularly the untouchables, cannot enter even the outer portions of a temple but must keep to the court-yards. In South Malabar, the high castes do not allow the Tiyans to cremate their dead.[59]

A Brahmin never bows to anyone who is not a Brahmin, but requires others to salute him; and when he is saluted by a member of a non-Brahmin caste he only pronounces a benediction. Some of the lower castes carry their reverence for the Brahmins, especially in Northern India, to such extremes that they will not cross the shadow of a Brahmin, and sometimes will not take their food without sipping water in which the big toe of a Brahmin is dipped. The Brahmin, on the other hand, is so conscious of his superiority that he does not condescend to bow even to the idols of gods in a Śūdra's house.[60] The Brahmin has been regarded as the most important subject, needing protection from the king, so much so that the king is styled the protector of the Brahmins and the cows, other subjects being regarded as too insignificant to be mentioned.

In the Maratha country, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the great preacher Ramadas tried to inculcate in the minds of the people the idea of unity based on the bond of common locality. During the latest period of the Peshwa-rule (latter half of the eighteenth century), however, this ideal dwindled into the orthodox one wherein Brahmins figure prominently, the State having no higher function than that of pampering them.[61] Under the Hindu rulers the Brahmins must have secured to themselves many pecuniary privileges, denied to others, on the strength of this orthodox theory of the proper function of the State, and perhaps more because they happened to occupy the posts of importance. Thus in the Maratha region during the period referred to above, the Konkanastha Brahmin clerks obtained the privilege of their goods being exempted from certain duties and their imported corn being carried to them without any ferry-

charges. Brahmin landholders of a part of the country had their lands assessed at distinctly lower rates than those levied from other classes. Brahmins were exempted from capital punishment, and when confined in forts, they were more liberally treated than the other classes.[62] Forbes makes the following observation: "The Brahmins of Travancore, as in most other parts of India, have taken care to be exempted as much as possible from punishment; at least, their sentence is far more lenient than that passed on the other castes for the same crimes."[63] In Bengal the amount of rent for land frequently varied with the caste of the occupant.[64]

(5) Lack of unrestricted choice of occupation:—Generally a caste or a group of allied castes considered some of the callings as its hereditary occupation, to abandon which in pursuit of another, though it might be more lucrative, was thought not to be right. Thus a Brahmin thought that it was correct for him to be a priest, while the Chambhar regarded it as his duty to cure hides and prepare shoes. This was only generally true, for there were groups of occupations like trading, agriculture, labouring in the field, and doing military service which were looked upon as anybody's, and most castes were supposed to be eligible for any of them.[65] Among the artisans, occupations which were more or less of the same status were opened to the members of these castes without incidental degradation. No caste would allow its members to take to any calling which was either degrading, like toddy-tapping and brewing, or impure, like scavenging or curing hides. It was not only the moral restraint and the social check of one's caste-fellows that acted as a restraint on the choice of one's occupation, but also the restriction put by other castes, which did not allow members other than those of their own castes to follow their callings. Of such restrictive regulations there were in operation only those concerning the profession of priests, no one not born a Brahmin being allowed to be a priest. The effect of these rules was that the priestly profession was entirely monopolized by the Brahmins, leaving aside the ministrants of the aboriginal deities, while they were seen plying any trade or calling which suited their tastes and

which was not polluting. The majority of the Konkanastha and Deshastha Brahmins of the Maratha country were dovoted to secular pursuits filling offices of every kind, including the village accountantship.[66] During the Maratha upheaval and after, the Brahmins entered the profession of arms in fairly large numbers. Before the Indian Mutiny the Kanaujia Brahmins used to enter the Bengal army as sepoys in large numbers.[67] Some of the Rarhi Brahmins of Bengal accepted service under Mohammedan rulers.[68] Some of the Brahmins of Rajputana served their Marwadi masters.[69] The majority of the Brahmins in the lower Carnatic, according to Buchanan, almost entirely filled the different offices in the collection of revenue and even acted as messengers.[70] Of the Hindustani Brahmins of Central India it is said that a considerable population of them are concerned in trade.[71] The Havig Brahmins of the Tulu country did all kinds of agricultural labour excepting holding the plough.[72] About the Kanaujia Brahmins of the United Provinces it is asserted that they even till the soil with their own hands, while shop-keeping and hawking form the main source of livelihood for the Sanadhya Brahmins of that region.[73] In Rajputana the Brahmin is not only willing to do all the labour that his piece of land requires, but is also ready to sell his labour to other more fortunate occupants.[74] Brahmins in Madras appear as civil, public, and military servants, traders, cultivators, industrialists, and even labourers.[75] It seems that in the days of Akbar, too, the Brahmins were engaged in trade, cultivation, or any advantageous pursuit in general.[76]

More castes than one are engaged in agriculture, as for example, the Vellalas, the Reddys, and the Naickers in Southern India.[77] As regards the five artisan castes, grouped together as Panchakalsi, it is observed that it is not impossible for individuals to pass from one occupation to another without any alteration of social status or loss of right of intermarriage.[78] Weaving is practised by many of the menial castes including even the impure castes of Mahars and Chamars. If one looks at the Census Reports, especially those for 1901, one finds groups, which are regarded as separate castes, following more

callings than one. The following remark of Russel is very instructive from this point of view. He observes: "Several castes have same traditional occupation; about forty of the castes of the Central Provinces are classified as agriculturists, eleven as weavers, seven as fishermen and so on."[79] In 1798 Colebrooke wrote: "Daily observation shows even Brahmins exercising the menial profession of a Śūdra. We are aware that every caste forms itself into clubs or lodges, consisting of the several individuals of that caste residing within a small distance, and that these clubs or lodges govern themselves by particular rules or customs or by-laws. But though some restrictions and limitations, not founded on religious prejudices, are found among their by-laws, it may be received as a general maxim that the occupation appointed for each tribe is entitled to a preference. Every profession, with few exceptions, is open to every description of person."[80] When Irving says,[81] "If we except the priesthood, caste has not necessarily any effect on the line of life in which a man embarks," he certainly overstates the position, and the following observation of Baines strikes the true note. "The occupation, again, which is common to the latter (the caste), is a traditional one, and is not by any means necessarily that by which all, or even most, of the group make their living in the present day."[82]

(6) Restrictions on Marriage:—Most of the groups, whose features I have attempted to characterize above, are further divided into a number of sub-groups, every one of which forbids its members to marry persons from outside it. Each of these groups, popularly known as sub-castes, is thus endogamous. This principle of strict endogamy is such a dominant aspect of caste-society that an eminent sociologist is led to regard endogamy as "the essence of the caste system."[83] There are, however, a few exceptions to this general rule of marrying within one's own group which are due to the practice of hypergamy. In some parts of the Punjab, especially in the hills, a man of a higher caste can take to wife a girl from one of the lower castes, while, in Malabar, the younger sons of the Nambudiri and other Brahmins consort with the Kshatriya and Nayar women, among whom mother-right

prevails. Excepting for these cases of inter-caste hypergamy each group has to contract matrimonial alliances within its own limits. Outside of this practice the only other authentic case where inter-caste marriage is allowed is that of some of the artisan castes of Malabar.[84] Any man venturing to transgress this law will be put out of his own sub-caste and it is doubtful if he would be admitted into the folds of any other respectable caste. To illustrate from the Maratha region, a Konkanastha Brahmin must marry a girl born in a Konkanastha Brahmin family, while a Karhada Brahmin must similarly seek his partner from amongst the Karhada Brahmins and so on, the principle being that marriage must be arranged within the group which is most effectively considered to be one's own. If this rule is violated expulsion from the membership of the group is generally the penalty which the offending parties have to suffer. In Gujarat the unit within which all matrimonial alliances must be contracted is very often still smaller than the so-called sub-caste of the Marathi region. Among the Banias, the trading caste, for example, there are not only the divisions of Shrimali, Porwal, Modh, etc. but there are further sub-divisions like Dasa Porwal and Visa Porwal.[85] This is not all. The Dasas are still further required to contract their marriages either from amongst the Dasas of Surat or of Bombay according as they belong to Surat or Bombay. When the groups are so much subdivided the penalty for transgressing the rule of endogamy in reference to the smallest unit is not expulsion of the offending parties but the gratification by them of the offended groups.

To regard endogamy as the chief characteristic of a caste is to treat all so-called sub-castes as the real castes. Gait[86] advances two reasons against this procedure of raising sub-castes to the position of castes, viz. it would be "contrary to the native feeling on the subject," and would be "highly inconvenient in practice, as it would create a bewildering multiplicity of castes." As for the second objection, we may safely pass it over, as it concerns only an administrative difficulty. As regards the Indian sentiment against making a sub-caste into a caste, it must be pointed out that, at best,

this is the representation of only one side of the problem; for if, to confine myself to the Maratha country, a Sāraswat Brahmin is known to the outsiders as a Saraswat, to a Sāraswat he is better known either as a Shenvi or as a Sashtikar or Pednekar. Stated generally, though it is the caste that is recognized by the society at large it is the sub-caste that is regarded by the particular caste and the individual. It is mainly indifference towards others, so characteristic of the Indian system, that is responsible for this attitude. For a Brahmin most others are Śūdras, irrespective of high or low status; and for two or three higher castes that are allied to the Brahmins in culture, the rest of the population, excepting the impure castes and some other specific groups, is Kulwādi or Śūdra—a generic term for manual workers. The higher castes are grouped together as either Ashrafin in Bihar,[87] Bhadralok in Bengal, or Pāndhar-peśe in Maharashtra. Further, if we are to take some kind of Indian sentiment as our guide in our analysis, then, as according to the orthodox theory on this matter there are only two, or at the most three castes in the present age, we shall have to divide the whole population of any major linguistic province into two castes, Brahmin and Śūdra, or at the most three, where the existence of the Kshatriya is grudgingly granted. Evidently no scientific student of caste, not even Gait himself, has proposed to follow Indian opinion on this matter. There is ample reason why, to get a sociologically correct idea of the institution, we should recognize sub-castes as real castes.

Of the features of a caste society dealt with so far three pertain to the caste as a whole; for the status in the hierarchy of any sub-caste depends upon the status of the caste, from which follow the various civil and religious rights and disabilities, and the traditional occupation is determined by the nature of the caste. The other three features, which are very material in the consideration of a group from the point of view of an effective social life, viz. those that regulate communal life and prescribe rules as regards feeding, social intercourse and endogamy, belong to the sub-caste.

In the matter of the Panchayat or the caste-council, which is the tribunal for enforcing the moral and economic rules of the group, the sub-caste generally possesses its own council. In the Panjab this is the case in all castes, except the artisans and menials. "Where the sub-divisions are not very clearly defined, or where the numerical strength of the whole caste is small, there is one governing body for the whole caste."[88] The following description of the sub-caste in Bengal clearly brings out the function I have mentioned as peculiar to it. "Almost every caste is divided into a number of smaller groups which will only marry amongst themselves. Usually these groups will not eat together and often they will not even take water from each other or smoke from the same 'hukka' . . . These endogamous groups are generally known as sub-castes. Each sub-caste manages its own affairs quite independently of the others, and in the case of the lower castes each has its own separate *Panchayat* or standing committee, by which all social questions are decided."[89] In the United Provinces it is the sub-caste that forms the unit of social organization, and as such has its own council to look after its affairs quite independently of the similar councils of the other sub-castes.[90] Further, inter-dining and inter-drinking are restricted to the group which is endogamous.[91] About the Central Provinces Russell observes[92]: "The real unit of the system and the basis of the fabric of Indian society is this endogamous group or sub-caste." Though this group is usually little known outside the man's own caste, yet it is the members of the sub-caste that attend "the communal feasts held on the occasions of marriages, funerals and meetings of the caste [sub-caste] Panchayat". The remark of the Census Operator for Madras that it is the small endogamous sub-divisions "which are for all social purposes the real castes"[93] is corroborated by F. J. Richards in the case of Salem District when he observes: "The Unit of Hindu society is the endogamous group or sub-caste."[94] The description of the sub-caste of a Hindustani caste given by Sherring will illustrate this. He observes about the Barhai or carpenter caste of Hindustan that its seven sub-castes "are so distinct from one another that they

hold no direct social intercourse with each other, either by marriages, or by eating or smoking together."[95] Further, some of the sub-castes have such a distinctness about their cultural items, as for example among the Vellalas, that it is not possible to give a general account of the marriage and other customs applicable to all the sub-divisions. While some of them recognize freedom of divorce and re-marriage and even polyandry, others follow strictly the Brahmanic rules.[96] The remark of Gait that "as a rule the prohibition of inter-marriage between members of the different sub-castes is far less rigid than it is between members of different castes, and when the rule is broken, the penalty is usually not expulsion, but merely some form of atonement, after which the member of the higher of the two sub-castes concerned, and possibly his or her parents, take rank in the lower,"[97] may be urged as a potent reason why sub-castes should be treated as strictly subordinate to a caste. Here it must be pointed out that in the United Provinces at least "the penalty for breaches of sub-caste endogamy appears to be as severe as the penalty for similar breaches of caste-endogamy", and that, though the penalty for the transgression of rules about sub-caste commensality varies in different castes, it seems that generally caste and sub-caste commensality are much on a par in this respect.[98] Hence it is but proper to treat endogamy within each of the groups constituting caste-society as one of its principal features.

So far I have treated of the distinctions between groups in the caste-society, which were held together in a chain by the fact that they were arranged in a system, the apex of which was formed by the group designated Brahmin. Each of these groups, major as well as minor, generally known as castes and sub-castes, has a name. When any group of the same name happens to have a wide distribution, language delimits effective social intercourse, which obtains only amongst members of the same group speaking the same language. Whatever might have been the situation in the past, when the jurisdictional factor, as Jackson terms it,[99] was a force affecting such social intercourse, in the

beginning of the nineteenth century linguistic boundaries fixed the caste-limits. In any linguistic area there were from fifty to two hundred of these major groups divided into five hundred to two thousand minor groups. An individual's circle of community-feeling was any of these minor groups, in which he or she was born; but as far as civic life was concerned it was the major group that decided the status of an individual.

Of the major groups about half a dozen in each linguistic region were formed by primitive tribes, which were slowly absorbing whatever ideas they could from the Brahmanic civilization. They lived not as members of towns or villages but of hamlets of their own, and were shunned by the Brahmanized peoples. Apart from their desire to imitate Brahmanic ideals as interpreted by other castes, their bond of social solidarity with other groups was the economic gain that resulted from an exchange of their economic activities with them. More or less similarly circumstanced were another half a dozen or a dozen of nomadic castes. About five to fifteen groups, mostly artisans and special traders, were peculiar to the towns, where social coherence was the result of common government rather than that of the co-operation of the groups. The remaining castes were distributed among the villages, every village having about fifteen to thirty of them. And it was in the village that caste-society manifested its other aspect, viz. co-operation and inter-dependence. Village society was characterized by the possession of a number of permanent officials and menials, belonging to different castes, each having a definite status in the economic and civic life of the village. In India south of the Vindhyas the system was very highly developed, and the number of such dignitaries varied from twelve to twenty-four belonging to as many different castes. These persons, irrespective of their caste-status, had not only a voice in civic affairs but were also sometimes consulted in purely social and legal matters affecting the private lives of the individuals of any caste, resident in the village. In Northern India the system of village servants, though not so highly evolved

as in the south, yet served the purpose of harmonizing different groups, till the super-imposition of a dominant caste had lessened the importance of the village dignitaries that were there. These latter, because of the particular form of land-tenure and revenue system and of their almost servile tenure, had no status in civic affairs, much less were they consulted in the private affairs of the members of the dominant caste.[100] In its pristine glory, however, a village or a town had a council of elders chosen from all castes and representing all the avocations in the locality.

The whole village had to deal with the government of the locality in revenue matters. This had engendered a splendid sense of solidarity among the members of the village community who were dearly attached to their lands. The stability, co-operative spirit, and sense of solidarity seen in the village communities evoked the following remarks from Sir Charles Metcalfe, who fervently pleaded against the introduction of the system of collecting revenue directly from individual proprietors. He observes: "The village communities are little republics, having nearly everything that they want within themselves, and almost independent of any foreign relations. They seem to last within themselves where nothing else lasts. Dynasty after dynasty tumbles down; revolution succeeds revolution; Hindoo, Pathan, Mogul, Mahratta, Sikh, English, are all masters in turn; but the village communities remain the same. In times of trouble they arm and fortify themselves: an hostile army passes through the country: the village communities collect their cattle within their walls, and let the enemy pass unprovoked . . . If a country remains for a series of years the scene of continued pillage and massacre, so that the villages cannot be inhabited, the scattered villagers nevertheless return whenever the power of peaceable possession revives. A generation may pass away, but the succeeding generation will return. The sons will take the places of their fathers; the same site for the village, the same position for the houses, the same lands will be occupied by the descendants of those who were driven out when the village was depopu-

lated; and it is not a trifling matter that will drive them out, for they will often maintain their post through times of disturbance and convulsion, and acquire strength sufficient to resist pillage and oppression with success . . . all acting in union with a common interest as regards the Government, and adjusting their own separate interests among themselves according to established usage."[101]

The decisions of the village-councils that have come down to us from the Maratha country, bear the signatures of almost all the village-servants, including the untouchable Mahar and Mang.[102] An entry in the Private Diary of Anandaranga Pillay of the middle of the eighteenth century refers to a village-meeting called to consider a case of temple-desecration "in which people of all castes—from the Brahmin to the Pariah—took part".[103] Dr. Matthai quotes the description of a meeting of a village Panchayat in which both the Brahmins and the Śūdras took part. The Brahmin school-master of the place was the accused, he having inflicted exceptionally severe punishment on one of the boys under his charge. The Brahmin members sat on a higher platform and the Śūdras on a lower veranda, both the sections indulging freely in betel and tobacco-snuff.[104] In the diaries of the Peshwas of Poona and the Raja of Satara there are a few references to meetings of the whole village community, assembled to adjudicate quarrels between Brahmins or to offer authoritative advice in their domestic matters. A Brahmin Kulkarni had one son who had married two wives, one of whom had borne him only two daughters. On the sudden death of the son, his senior wife resolved to immolate herself. The whole village, including all the village dignitaries, was called in conference. In view of the old man's helpless condition the assembly proposed that the lady should adopt a son before burning herself. This decision was agreed to by the old man and his daughter-in-law. The whole assemblage further, in consultation with the persons concerned, selected the person to be adopted and made a request for him to his guardian.[105] A quarrel between Brahmin cousins in respect of some hereditary rights was referred

for settlement to the whole village. The assembly that was to give the decision included Maratha, Dhangar, Gurav, Sutar, Lohar, Kumbhar, Koli, Nhavi, Chambhar, Mahar, and Mang.[106]

Ideas of status were quietly accepted and did not prevent healthy co-operation and neighbourly feeling among the various caste-groups represented in the vigorous village communities of Southern India. In the case of Northern India we must remember that though, perhaps, village life did not lead to as much co-operation and fellow-feeling, the system of castes was marked by a more linient view and practice about food and social intercourse. The various castes, in so far as they contributed their respective services towards the common life of the village, were welded together and inter-dependent for the purposes of civic life. Inter-dependence of castes was such a deep-rooted principle that it prevented other exclusive aspects, inherent in the system, from getting the better of the idea of a common civic goal and human sympathy for co-residents and hardening into caste-spirit or caste-patriotism. If interdependence in civic and economic life of the village counteracted the centripetal forces of social restrictions of caste, certain special functions and occasions reminded some castes, ordinarily considered to be low, of their importance and even afforded them opportunities of enjoying temporary superiority.

In parts of the United Provinces the barber often acts as a match-maker and is present at weddings. The Dom at the burning "ghat" in Benares is an important personage. "Some years ago the head of the caste used to be conveyed to the funeral of a wealthy client in his own palanquin." The first five logs of wood for arranging the pyre must be given by a Dom, who has also to lay the foundation of the pyre and to hand a wisp of burning straw to the chief mourner for lighting the wood.[107] In the Central Provinces, as a part of the marriage ceremony, the bridegroom's party takes the bride to the house of the Kumbhar (potter) for making the marriage propitious. The wife of the potter

presents her with seven new pots which are to be used at the wedding. In return for this veiled blessing the woman gets a present of clothes.[108] Both the barber and the washerman are prominent in a Kunbi wedding. At a particular stage in the ceremony the barber and the washerman take the bride and bridegroom on their shoulders and dance in the marriage-booth, for which services they receive presents.[109] In Berar "at the Holi festival the fire of the Mahars is kindled first and that of the Kunbis is set alight from it". Some Telis (oil-pressers), Lohars (blacksmiths), Kunbis and other castes employ a Mahar (one of the untouchables) to fix the date of their wedding. The Mahar also officiates at the slaughter of a buffalo at the Dasahra festival.[110] The barber acts as the Brahmin's assistant at marriage, and to the lower castes he is even the matrimonial priest.[111] The officiating priest at the famous temple of Jagannath is a barber, food cooked for the deity by him being acceptable to all but the most orthodox amongst Brahmins. For some of the Vellalas (Tamil cultivators) he even acts as the marriage-priest.[112] "Some of the most celebrated and exclusive temples are thrown open to the Paraiyan (the Tamil unapproachable) on certain days of the year, and for the time he lords it over the Brahmin." At some festivals at the temples of Siva or of the local goddess he sits by the side of the idol in the procession or ties the badge of marriage round its neck. "When there is a dispute about a boundary, it is a Paraiyan, or in other parts of India, a member of the corresponding caste, who has to walk the line with a pot of water, his own son, or a clod of his native earth, on his head".[113] These and other occasions, on which some of the groups, which were considered to be low castes, could feel their importance, relieved the monotonous depression of these groups, and gave zest to their life even in their degraded condition.

To sum up, in each linguistic area there were about two hundred groups called castes with distinct names, usually birth in one of which determined the status in society of a given individual, which were divided into about two thou-

sand smaller units—generally known as sub-castes—fixing the limits of marriage and effective social life and making for specific cultural tradition. These major groups were held together by the possession with few exceptions, of a common priesthood. There was a sort of an overall counting which grouped all of them into five or six classes, overtly expressed or tacitly understood. Over a large part of the country they were welded together for civil life in the economy and civics of village communities. Common service to the civic life, prescriptive rights of monopolist service, and specific occasions for enjoying superiority for some of the castes, considered very low, made the village community more or less a harmonious civic unit. Complete acceptance of the system in its broad outlines by the groups making up that system and their social and economic interdependence in the village not only prevented the exclusivist organization of the groups from splitting up the system into independent units, but created a harmony in civic life. Of course, this harmony was not the harmony of parts that are equally valued, but of units which are rigorously subordinated to one another.

1. Baines, p. 11.
2. Quotation from Megasthenes' account in Wilson. vol. i, p. 347.
3. p. 124. footnote.
4. *The New Statesman, Special Supplement*, 28th April, 1917, p. 38.
5. Gujarat Brahmins do have such councils. See Borradaile's *Gujarat Caste-rules*, translated into Gujarati by Mangaldas Nathoobhoy.
6. Hultsch, i, No. 56.
7. *United Provinces Census*, 1911, p. 337; *Panjab Census*, 1911, pp. 420-21; also cf. Hamilton, i, p. 110; Kerr, pp. 316-19; Martin, vol. iii, pp. 179-80; and Steele, pp. 150-1.
8. The result of this fact is to be seen in the departure of the customs of many castes from the rules laid down in the Hindu sacred laws. See Steele, p. 124 and Appendix A.
9. *United Provinces Census*, 1911, p. 337.
10. *Bengal Census*, 1911, pp. 467-9.
11. Ibid., p. 487.
12. *Godavari Dist. Gaz.* vol. i, p. 48.
13. Russell, ii, p. 31.
14. Crooke, i, pp. 45, 109; ii, pp. 93, 219, 326; iii, 247, 332; iv, 33, 43.
15. M. R. Majmudar in *Ghurye Felicitation Volume*, p. 282.

16. *Madras Census*, 1871, p. 137.
17. M. G. Ranade in JBBRAS., vol. xx, p. 476.
18. *Madras Census*, 1871, p. 151 and footnote.
19. *Mysore Census*, 1901, p. 400.
20. Martin, vol. ii, p. 466.
21. *U.P. Census*, 1901, p. 227.
22. *U.P. Census*, 1911, p. 328.
23. *U.P. Census*, 1901, p. 212.
24. Risley (2), p. 159.
25. *U.P. Census*, 1911, p. 329.
26. *U.P. Census*, 1911, p. 331.
27. Risley (1), vol. ii, p. 270.
28. *Bengal Census*, 1901, p. 367.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Forbes, ii, p. 240.
32. Bhattacharya, p. 255.
33. Wilson, vol. ii, pp. 74-5.
34. *Ency. of R. & E.*, vol. x, p. 491 (b).
35. Slater, p. 38.
36. *Trichinopoly Dist. Gaz.*, vol. i, p. 81.
37. Thurston, vi, p. 16.
38. *Bellary Dist. Gaz.*, p. 58.
39. Mann, p. 108.
40. Russell, iv, p. 189.
41. Thurston, vi, p. 88.
42. Russell, i, pp. 72-3.
43. *Panjab Census*, 1911, p. 413.
44. Briggs, p. 231.
45. *Ency. of R. & E.* ix, p. 636 (b); also compare Forbes, ii, p. 238.
46. Ranade, p. 478.
47. Bhattacharya, p. 259.
48. Logan, i, p. 85.
49. Bhattacharya, p. 259.
50. Wilson, ii, p. 77.
51. Wilson, ii, p. 79.
52. *Madras Census*, 1891, p. 224.
53. G. W. Forrest, *Official Writings of Mountstuart Elphinstone*, 1884, pp. 310-11.
54. *Madras Census*, 1871, p. 129.
55. D. V. Potdar, *Marathi Gadyacha Ingraji Avatar*, Appendix pp. 42-3.
56. Vad, *Sawai Madhavrao*, vol. iii, p. 280.
57. Ranade, p. 478; Vad, ibid, p. 287.
58. Ibid., p. 478.
59. *Madras Census*, 1891, p. 299.
60. Bhattacharya, pp. 19-20.

61. Ranade, p. 456; Vad, *Balaji Bajirao*, vol. i, pp. 306, 309, 337.
62. Ibid., p. 455.
63. James Forbes, *Oriental Memoirs*, vol. i, 1834, p. 256.
64. Holt Mackenzie in *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the affairs of the East India Company*, vol. iii, 1832, p. 216.
65. Rickards, i, p. 29.
66. Campbell, *Ethnology of India*, p. 73.
67. Wilson, ii, 151; also compare Martin, vol. i, p. 111.
68. Bhattacharya, p. 39.
69. Wilson, ii, p. 115.
70. Wilson, ii, p. 59.
71. Ibid., p. 188; also compare Malcolm, ii, pp. 122-3.
72. Wilson, ii, p. 67.
73. Bhattacharya, pp. 50-1.
74. Baines, p. 28.
75. *Madras Census*, 1871, p. 133.
76. Bose, ii, p. 27, quotation from *Ain-i-Akbari*.
77. Pandian, p. 81; for Central India, see Malcolm, ii, p. 169.
78. Baines, p. 59.
79. Russell, i, p. 9.
80. Quoted in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th Edition), vol. v, p. 465 (a).
81. p. 19.
82. *Ethnography*, p. 11.
83. Westermarck, ii, p. 59.
84. Baines, p. 59.
85. Compare Malcolm, ii, p. 162.
86. *Ency. of R. & E.*, vol. iii, p. 234.
87. Martin, i, p. 110.
88. *Panjab Census*, 1911, p. 417.
89. *Bengal Census*, 1901, p. 351.
90. *U.P. Census*, 1911, p. 333.
91. Ibid., p. 353.
92. Op. cit., vol. i, p. 10.
93. *Madras Census*, 1901, p. 128; also compare Kerr, p. 279: "You may sometimes hear a native say that he is a Brahmin. But not unfrequently when you ask him to name his caste, he mentions the minor sub-division, or perhaps the trade or profession, to which he belongs."
94. *Salem Dist. Gazetteer*, pp. 123-4.
95. Rev. M. A. Sherring, *Hindu Tribes and Castes*, Vol. i, 1872, p. xxii.
96. *Madras Census*, 1891, p. 234.
97. Gait, op. cit., p. 232.
98. *U.P. Census*, 1911, p. 354: Gait's observation may apply only to Gujarat.

99. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1907
100. Baden-Powell, p. 26; Altekar, p. 122. The latter's view, in my opinion, requires a little modification as in the text.
101. *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee on the affairs of the East India Company*, vol. iii (Revenue), 1832, pp. 331-2 (Appendix 84).
102. Altekar, p. 43.
103. Ibid., pp. 35-6.
104. Matthai, p. 20.
105. Vad, *Madhavrao I*, vol. ii, pp. 339, 341.
106. Vad, *Shahu Chhatrapati*, pp. 174, 176.
107. Crooke (2), pp. 102-29.
108. Russell, iv, pp. 6, 10.
109. Ibid., p. 20.
110. Ibid., pp. 18, 131.
111. Ibid., p. 265.
112. Thurston, i, pp. 32-4.
113. Baines, pp. 75-6. Note:—In this chapter I have quoted many authorities that are chronologically later, by half a century or more, than the period I have here in view. But other and older authorities are almost everywhere indicated. The reason is that the later authorities give more details and are easily accessible to most people.

2

Nature Of Caste-Groups

We have seen that in the Hindu caste-society there are a number of groups with distinct names. The nature of these names is likely to furnish us with a clue to some understanding of the process by which distinction between groups came to be formulated. Of the major groups called castes many bear names derived from the principal professions they followed or the crafts they practised and, in the majority of cases, are still engaged in. Brahmin means one who recites the prayer, the ritual formulae or incantations, and designates a group that was once wholly composed of individuals so engaged, though now it is the appellation of a group whose members are engaged not only in the priestly function, but also in the allied functions of clerks and writers, and even in pursuits absolutely foreign to the original ideals.

Of the groups carrying on trade and commerce a large number bear the name of Vani or Baniya, which is derived from a Sanskrit word meaning a trader. The Tamil Chetti seems also to refer to the avocation of the group in that linguistic area. Jat of the Panjab means cultivator, so also do Vellala of the Tamil and Vakkaliga of the Canarese country. Kurmi, Kunbi, and Kanbi perhaps signify the occupation of the group, viz. that of cultivation, though it is not improbable that the name may be of tribal origin. Kisan, the name of a cultivating caste of northern India, must be derived from the Sanskrit word for cultivation. Sometimes the connection of agriculture is brought out indirectly as in the name of the Lodha of the Central Provinces. The name is believed to mean "clod-hopper" from "loh", a clod.[1] The cattle-breeding group takes the significant name of Gauli, derived from a Sanskrit word for cow. Soni or Sonar, the name of the goldsmith caste, refers to the

material in which the group specializes. Barhai, Tarkhan, Tachchan and Sutar, the designations of the carpenter-caste in the different linguistic regions, point to the material worked on, the mode of working or the special implement of the craft. The names of the metal-working castes—Lohar, Tambat, Kasar, and Thathera—come from the metal handled by these groups, viz., iron, copper, bell-metal, and brass. Bunkar, Joria, Tanti, Koshti, Patwa, Pattanulkaran, and Sale are the designations of the various weaving castes. The first two are derived from a root meaning 'to put the threads together',[2] and the others from Sanskrit words for silk-cloth.[3] Kumbar or Kumbhar, the name of the potter-caste, means one who makes pots. Tili or Teli, the oil-presser, means either one who presses oil or one who handles seasamum. The names of the barber-caste are either derived from the Sanskrit word for barber or signify those who cut the hair. Lunia and Agri mean salt-workers. Bari, the leaf-plate-making caste, derives its name from "bar", a "plantation", and Tamboli, dealers in betel-leaf, from the Sanskrit word for betel-leaf. Dharkar means rope-maker and Bansphor, the basket-maker, means the bamboo-splitter. Chamar or Chambhar, the name of the leather-working caste, is derived from a Sanskrit word meaning worker in leather. Kahar, name of a North-Indian caste, formerly engaged chiefly as water-carriers but now as general and domestic servants, means a water-carrier. Pasi means a user of noose and is significantly the name of an aboriginal caste living by catching wild birds, small game and tapping palms. The names of the shepherd castes seem to be derived from words meaning sheep. Such is at least the case with Gadaria from "gadar", an old Hindi word for sheep.[4]

Many others of these major groups called castes bear merely tribal or ethnic names. Such are for example: Arora, Gujar, Lohana, Bhatia, Mina, Bhil, Dom, Oraon, Munda, Santal, Koch, Ahir, Mahar, Nayar, Maratha, Gond, Khond, etc.

Religious movements have not failed to give their names

to groups, which are now castes. The Bishnois and Sadhus, the Jogis, the Gosains, and the Manbhaos are some of the examples of sectarian castes. The first four of these began as orders emphasizing certain aspect of Hindu tenets, while the last group was the result of a reformist movement in the Maratha region.

A few of the groups have names emphasizing a peculiarity which is somehow regarded as specific, or are of the nature of nicknames. Musāhār, meaning mouse-eaters, is the name of a low aboriginal caste of the United Provinces. Bhangi, one who performs the useful function of removing night-soil, is a term probably applied to the caste simply as a token of contempt—those who are broken or outcast.[5] Bhulia, an Uriya caste of weavers, are so called merely because they are supposed to be a forgetful people—from "bhulna", "to forget".[6] Dangi, the name of a cultivating caste of the Central Provinces, means merely a hillman, perhaps referring to the former marauding activities of the now peaceful and once dominant people.[7] The Pankas of the Central Provinces are a caste of weavers and general labourers; but their name is believed to be derived from a certain incident in their conversion to the creed of Kabir and means those who are "from water", "pāni kā".[8] Dublā, one of the aboriginal tribes of Gujarat, are so called because they are weaklings,[9] "dublā" means weak. Naikdas of Gujarat are perhaps so designated in contempt, the term meaning "little Naik". Ramoshi, a thieving caste of the Deccan, is supposed to be a short form of Rama-Vaṁśi, i.e. descendant of Rama, the epic hero.[10] Kallan, the name of a Madras caste, means in Tamil a "thief". Tiyan, the toddy-tapping caste of Malabar, means a "southerner", as the Tiyans are believed to have migrated from Ceylon. Pariah, the name of the great untouchable caste of Madras, is commonly derived from a word for drum, which instrument is played by them.

A small number of these major groups are definitely known to be the outcome of miscegenation. Some of the

members of the higher castes of Orissa and the Kayasth immigrants into Orissa keep maids of Bhandari and other clean castes and treat them as their concubines. The issue of such unions is known by the name of Shagirdapesha.[11] The Bhilalas are well known to be the offspring of Rajput males and Bhil women.[12] Vidur, a Maratha caste of the Central Provinces, is wholly formed by individuals of mixed descent.[13]

A close study of the names of the various minor units, the so-called sub-castes, within the major groups reveals the fact that the bases of distinction leading to the exclusive marking off of these groups were: first, territorial or jurisdictional separateness; second, mixed origin; third, occupational distinction; fourth, some peculiarity in the technique of one and the same occupation; fifth, sectarian difference; sixth, dissimilarity of customs; and last, adventitious circumstances, suggesting certain nicknames.

Sub-castes that bear the name of some ancient city or locality are to be met with in the majority of the castes. The Ahirs of the Central Provinces have among their sub-castes, the following groups: Jijhotia, taking their name from Jajhoti, the classical designation of Bundelkhand; Narwaria from Narwar; Kosaria from Kosala, the ancient name of Chhattisgarh; and Kanaujia from Kanauj.[14] The Barai have the following endogamous sub-divisions: Chaurasia, from the Chaurasi pargana of Mirzapur District; Panagaria, from Panagar in Jubbulpore; Mahobia, from Mahoba; Jaiswar, from the town of Jais in Rai Bareli District; Gangapari, coming from the other side of the Ganges.[15] The Brahmins of Bengal have among their sub-castes the following names: Paschatya, from the western part of India; Radhiya from Radh, the old name of Western Bengal and Barendra from the northern part of Bengal.[16] The names of the sub-castes of the Brahmin caste of the United Provinces are most of them territorial in origin: Kanaujia from Kanuj; Maithil from Mithila; Jijhotia from Jajhoti; Saraswat, named after the River Saraswati; and Gaur from an old name of a large

part of Northern India. Most of the sub-castes of the Brahmins of the Maratha country bear names of localities: Konkanasth from the Konkan; Deshasth from the Desh, the Deccan plateau. The Saraswat Brahmins have more than six sub-castes, all territorial in origin. Of the numerous sub-castes of the Gujarat Brahmins the majority bear territorial names, like Agarwal, from Agra; Deshval, Harsola, Jharola, Modh, Nagar, Osval, Porval, Shrimali, Sorathia, all of them being derived from old names of localities once independent in their jurisdiction.[17] Many of the sub-divisions of the Smarta Brahmins of the Telugu country bear names derived from the old names of the various parts of that country: Velnad, Vengi Nadu, Kasal Nadu, Mulki Nadu, and Telaga Nadu. The sub-caste of the Kanara Kamma Vaidika is formed by Brahmins who originally came from the Kanarese country but are now naturalized in the Telugu country.[18] Following are some of the other castes among which the sub-castes bear territorial names: Vania, Mochi, Kansara, Sutar, Charan, Kumbhar, Dhed, Darji, Lohar, and Koli among Gujarat castes; Kayasth, Bania and Vaidya, among the North Indian castes; Chambhar, Gaoli, Koli, Kumbhar, Kunbi, Lohar, Mahar, Mali, Nhavi, Sutar and Vani among the Maratha castes.

Many castes have divisions bearing names reminiscent of the ethnic origins of these sub-groups. Many tribes, either because some of their members followed a particular occupation or because some of them intermarried with the members of a particular caste-in-formation, have contributed their names to sub-castes. The professions and castes, which allowed or tolerated the infusion of tribal people, still distinguished the groups formed by such inclusion or mesalliance. This is how many of the occupational castes have come to possess sub-castes bearing tribal names. This process of infusion and left-handed marriage does not seem to have been restricted to tribes alone. In spite of the so-called rigidity of caste, it appears that many of the occupational and tribal castes, either permitted or connived at the intrusion of members of other castes. Only they tried to keep

the progeny and the group formed by them distinct from their original group. Thus the sub-castes of some of the major castes have composite names derived from the names of other castes. The Barai, a caste of betel-vine growers in the Central Provinces, have a sub-division called the Kumbhardhang, who are supposed to be the descendants of a potter. The Basors, workers in bamboo, have the following sub-castes: Dumar or Dom-Basors, Basors who are derived from the Dom-tribe; Dhubela, perhaps from the Dhobi caste; Dharkar, which is the name also of a large caste of rope-makers in Northern India. The Chambhars, leather workers of the Maratha country, have Ahir as one of their sub-castes. The Chamars of the Central Provinces, have a sub-caste named Korchamars who "are said to be the descendants of alliance between Chamars and Koris or weavers".[19] The Sali, a weaving caste of Maratha country, has Ahir, Maratha, and Chambhar sub-castes, which announce their origins from the different ethnic and occupational groups. The Dhimars, a caste of fishermen and palanquin-bearers of the Central Provinces, retain in the name of one of their sub-castes its traditional origin from the Gonds. Among the Dheds, as among many castes of Gujarat, is a sub-caste named Gujar, derived from a medieval tribe of that name. Among the Gaulis, cowherds of the Maratha country, are to be found sub-castes bearing the name of Ahir, Kunbi, Kuruba, and Maratha. Gondhali, a composite caste of religious minstrels, has sub-castes bearing the names of other well-known castes of the Maratha country, like the Brahman, Dhangar, and Kumbhar. The Kolis of the Deccan have Agri, Ahir, and Bhil among their sub-castes. Nesfield has found among some castes of the United Provinces sub-castes styled after the Kol tribe, which seem to have taken to various occupations during the formative period of the caste-system.[20] Among the Kunbis of Nagpur is a sub-caste bearing the name Manwa derived from the Manas, who were once a dominant people in Chanda district. The Khandesh Kunbis have, as one of their sub-castes, Kumbhar, which is the name of the potter-caste. "Bodies of the Kori and Katia weaving castes of Northern India have been amalgamated with the Mahars in

Districts where they have come together along the Satpura Hills and Nerbudda Valley," the latter caste still having Katia as one of its sub-castes.[21] Kunbi is one of the sub-castes of the Nhavis, the Maratha caste of barbers. The Pardhans of the Central Provinces have a sub-caste called Ganda, supposed to be the offspring of intermarriages between the two castes.[22] Among the Shimpis or Maratha tailors, one finds Ahir and Maratha as two of their sub-castes, derived from well-known castes. "The Teli-Kalars appear to be a mixed group of Kalars who have taken to the oilman's profession, and the Teli-Banias are Telis who have become shopkeepers.[23]

The nature of many of the occupations is such that though from a broad point of view each may be regarded as distinct, yet on closer scrutiny it presents differences which are sufficient to distinguish one aspect of it from another. Thus though leather-working may be regarded as one occupation by the society, the followers of that occupation may distinguish different branches of leather-working as shoe-making, sandal-making, or oilcan-making. Such detailed distinctions within an occupation have been thought to be adequate to designate the group of members following the particular branch of the occupation by the name of that branch. Sub-castes within many of the occupational castes bear names derived from the special branches of the occupations. Among the Chamars of the Central Provinces there are many sub-castes whose names are derived from the particular articles of leather that their members are engaged in making. The members of the sub-caste Budalgir prepare "budlas" or oilcans of leather. Jingars are saddle-makers. The Katwa sub-caste specializes in leather-cutting. The Dhimar caste of the Central Provinces has Bansia and Bandhaiya as two of its sub-castes. The former term is derived from "bansi", a bamboo fishing-rod, and the latter means those who make ropes and sacking of hemp and fibre. The Kunbis have a sub-caste called Tilole presumably because once they cultivated the seasamum (til) plant. Among the Lonaris of Belgaum there are two sub-divisions styled after

their particular article which they prepare as Mith (salt) and Chune (lime). Phul Mali, Kacha Mali, Jire Mali, and Halde Mali, together forming the bulk of the Mali-caste, are sub-castes which take their names from occupational specialization. Thus the Phul Mali is a florist, the Kacha Malis prepare the cotton braid, the Jire grow cumin seed (jire), and the Halde grow "halad" or turmeric. The Koshtis of the Central Provinces have Patwi and Sutsale as two of their sub-castes. Patwis make the braid of silk-thread and sew silk-thread on ornaments. Sutsales weave mostly cotton-thread.

Many sub-castes, especially among the castes that are either of the nature of ethnic groups or carry on secondary undefined occupations, are named from the nature of their special economic activities. Singaria, Tankiwala, Dhuria, Sonjhara, and Kasdhonia are some of the sub-divisions of the Dhimar caste in the Central Provinces. Singarias cultivate "singara" or water-nut. Tankiwalas are sharpeners of grind-stones. Dhurias sell parched rice. Sonjharas wash for gold, and Kasdhonias wash the sand of sacred rivers to pick coins dropped in them by devout pilgrims. The Garpagari Jogi derives the name of his sub-caste from his occupation of using magic to avert hailstorms. The Manihari Jogis are pedlars selling beads, and the Ritha Biknath are so-called because they sell "ritha" or soap-nut. Khaire, Dhanoje, and Lonhare are three of the sub-castes of the Kunbis of the Central Provinces. Khaires presumably used to make catechu from "khair"; Dhanoje are those who tend small stock or "dhan", and Lonhare formerly refined salt. The Lonaria sub-caste of the Mahars of the Central Provinces is engaged in salt-making. The Dhangars have Mendhes and Mhaskes as two of their sub-divisions, named because they keep sheep (mendhi) and buffaloes (mhashi) respectively.

The Mang-garudis, a sub-division of the Mang-caste, are so called because they are snake-charmers; the Tokarphodes take their name from their occupation of splitting (phod) bamboo (tokar); the Nades are so called because they make

"nadas" or ropes. The Mangmochis are leather-workers. Kakars make ropes of untanned hide.[24] Nhavis, the barbers of the Maratha country, have among their sub-castes Vajantri and Mashalji. The former are so called because they play music and the latter because they carry torches (mashal) before processions. Among Mahars of the Maratha country two of their sub-divisions are named Panya and Bele, the former from their working with leaves for making umbrellas and the latter from their making mats from chips of bamboo. In the Central Provinces the Yerande Telis, who are a sub-caste of the Teli caste, take their name from the fact that formerly they pressed only "erandi" or castor oil seed. The Sao Telis have given up oil-pressing and are now cultivators.[25]

Peculiarities connected with the apparatus or technique of an occupation have given their names to the sub-divisions of some of the occupational castes. The Kumbhar, potters of the Maratha country, distinguish those who make pots by hand without the wheel as Hatghades (hand-potters), those who use a big wheel as Thorchake ("thor," big, and "chak", wheel), and those who use a small wheel as Lahanchake ("lahan," small). In the Central Provinces the potter-caste has the first sub-caste, but not the last two. Instead they have Chākere and Kurere, the latter using a revolving stone slab instead of a wheel. In addition they have a sub-caste called Goria because the members of this sub-division make white pots only and not black ones. In the Nagpur district the Telis have two principal sub-divisions. Ekbaile are those who yoke only one bullock to their press while Dobaile yoke two bullocks.

Differences of religious schools or sects have given names to sub-divisions among some castes. The old distinctions on the basis of the Veda, which was traditionally followed by the members of a group, have persisted among the Deshastha Brahmins of the Maratha country leading to endogamous restrictions. Among them the Rigvedis and Yajurvedis—the followers of the Rig-veda and of the Yajur-veda—are so far distinct as to be sub-castes. Later creeds and reformatory movements have also left their marks on

caste organization. Among the Deshastha Brahmins there is also an endogamous group, whose members are supposed to be the descendants of Eknath, a reforming saint of Maharashtra.[26] The South Indian Brahmins carry their religious differences to such an extent that generally the Smartas and Vaishnavas are regarded as sub-castes. The Chamars of the Central Provinces have amongst them a large sub-caste named Satnami because the members are followers of the Satnami sect. The Padam Salis have Hindu and Lingayat divisions which are endogamous. So also have the Gavlis, the Kumbhars and Malis, Lingayat divisions among them. The Pankas, a Dravidian caste of weavers, have Kabirha and Saktaha as their principal sub-castes. The Kabirhas are the followers of the sect of Kabir and the Saktahas profess to belong to the Sakta creed.[27]

Differences in customs and diet have been regarded as so important that some of the castes recognize groups with such differences as sub-castes, though the names of these do not necessarily take after the differences. The Berads of Bombay have two sub-castes, the difference between them being that the members of one eat the flesh of buffaloes, bullocks or pigs, and allow their women to follow prostitution, while the members of the other do not tolerate these practices. These latter are termed Bile, i.e. white or pure, and the former Kare or black. Dhor, one of the five subdivisions of the Katkaris, is so called because the members eat beef. Moger, a Canarese fishing-caste, has three subdivisions named according to their rules of inheritance: Aliyasantanas, Makalasantanas, and Randesantanas, i.e. those who inherit through females, those who inherit through males, and those who are progeny of re-married widows.[28] The Kunbis of the Central Provinces have a sub-caste called Gadhao because they formerly kept donkeys (gadhav).

Many castes have sub-castes, whose names are derived from some real peculiarity now forgotten, or some adventitious circumstance to which importance is attached, and which is used to distinguish the members of the group, or,

in the case of miscegenation, from the fact of mere illegitimacy of unions, the exact lineage not being attended to. The Basors of the Central Provinces have a section called Purania or Juthia because they are supposed to be the illegitimate progeny of Ahir wet-nurses (dai), employed in Rajput households. The Chungia Chamars are a branch of the Satnami Chamars and are so called because, contrary to the rules of the sect, they smoke evidently by means of a leaf-pipe (chungia). The Daijanya sub-caste of the Chamars is so called because their women act as midwives, though this business is practised by women of other sub-castes as well. The Dhimars have a sub-caste which is merely named Nadha or those who live on the banks of streams. Their Suvarha and Gadhewale sub-castes derive their names from their special association with two unclean animals, pig and ass. The Mahars disclose a sense of humour by designating the group of descendants of illicit unions by the term Dharmik (pious). The Pardhans, on the contrary, apply a prosaic term to such a group among them. It is known as "Thothia" or "maimed". Though "langoti" or a narrow piece of cloth is the loincloth of many poor castes, the Pardhis have hit upon its use as the distinctive mark of their members and call one of their sub-castes Langoti. The Kumbhars have Gadhere, Bardia, and Sungaria as three of their sub-castes, these groups deriving their names from the animal they use or keep: ass, bullock, and pig respectively. The Dhangars of Bombay call their bastard brethren "kadu", while the Gujarat Kumbhars use the term Vatalia, i.e. polluted, to designate such members.

Such is the picture of caste-groups presented by facts mostly taken from the Central Provinces and Bombay Presidency, both of which regions are outside the centre of old Brahmanic culture. In the home of the Brahmanic culture, the United Provinces, the same principles can be discerned from the nomenclature of the castes and sub-castes. One additional and important feature of the caste origination of the province is that the names of Rajput clans and those of some of the eponymous personages figure very largely in the names of the sub-castes of many major groups.[29]

1. Russell, iv, p. 113.
2. Nesfield, p. 21.
3. Russell, iii, p. 581, and iv, p. 386.
4. Nesfield, p. 11.
5. Enthoven, i, p. 105.
6. Russell, ii, p. 320.
7. Russell, ii, pp. 457-8.
8. Russell, iv, p. 324.
9. Enthoven, i, p. 341.
10. Enthoven, iii, p. 297.
11. Risley, (2), p. 83.
12. Enthoven, i, p. 153.
13. Russell, iv, p. 596.
14. Russell, ii, pp. 24-5.
15. Ibid., p. 193.
16. Bhattacharya, p. 35.
17. Enthoven, i, p. 221. Some of the Gujarat castes are further sub-divided according to the cities in which they reside, e.g., Shrimali Baniyas of Surat and those of Ahmedabad, etc.
18. Bhattacharya, p. 99.
19. Nesfield, p. 106.
20. Nesfield, p. 106.
21. Russell, iv, p. 133.
22. Russell, iv, p. 354.
23. Ibid., p. 546.
24. Enthoven, ii, p. 436.
25. Russell, iv, p. 546.
26. Enthoven, iii, 327.
    N.B.:—It is a curious fact that among the Gujarat Baniyas the religious differences have not led to rigorous interdicting of inter-marriage. There is no serious objection to marriages between Jain and Vaishnav Baniyas. Compare Malcolm, ii, p. 162.
27. Russell, iv, p. 325.
28. Enthoven, iii, p. 60.
29. W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, vol. i, pp. clxiv-v.

3

Caste Through The Ages

I have here sought to give a picture of Hindu caste-society as it was functioning before modern ideas affected its course. We have now to see how it came to be what it was. For the convenience of such historical treatment I propose to break up the history of India into four periods. First, the Vedic period ending about 600 B.C. and comprising the literary data of the Vedic Saṁhitās and the Brāhmaṇās; second, the post-Vedic period, extending to about the third century of the Christian era. In this period we have three types of literature which shed light on this subject. The sacred laws of the Aryas present the orthodox and the more or less idealistic standpoint while the epics testify to the contemporary practices. Buddhist literature, on the other hand, gives a glimpse of the institution as it appeared to those who rebelled against it and in part provides us with a natural picture of some aspects of caste. The third period may be styled the period of the Dharma-śāstras and ends with the tenth or eleventh century A.D. Manu, Yājnavalkya and Vishnu are the chief exponents of the social ideals of this age. The fourth period may, with propriety, be called the modern period, and it brings us down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The customs and beliefs of contemporary Hindus are those that were mostly fixed and classified by the writers of this period. It was during this period that the present-day vernaculars of India were being evolved. A fresh religion and a somewhat different ethnic stock, accounting for many of our present-day political and social problems were also introduced during this age. The idealistic point of view is provided by writers like Parāśara, Hemādri, and Mādhava, while the inscriptions and travellers' accounts reveal some of the realities of the times.

It must be mentioned at the outset that all the literary accounts of the important aspects of caste centre round the four orders in society, namely Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra, and not the multifarious groups which are the present-day castes.

In the Rigveda, the earliest literature of the first period, three classes of society are very frequently mentioned, and named Brahma, Kshatra, and Viś. The first two represented broadly the two professions of the poet-priest and the warrior-chief. The third division was apparently a group comprising all the common people. It is only in one of the later hymns, the celebrated Purushasūkta, that a reference has been made to four orders of society as emanating from the sacrifice of the Primeval Being. The names of those four orders are given there as Brāhmana, Rājanya, Vaiśya, and Sūdra, who are said to have come respectively from the mouth, the arms, the thighs, and the feet of the Creator. The particular limbs associated with these divisions and the order in which they are mentioned probably indicate their status in the society of the time, though no such interpretation is directly given in the hymn.

This origin of the four classes is repeated in most of the later works with slight variations and interpretative additions. The Taittirīya Saṁhitā, for example, ascribes the origins of those four classes to the four limbs of the Creator and adds an explanation. The Brahmins are declared to be the chief because they were created from the mouth, punning on the word "mukha" ("mouth" and "chief"). The Rājanyas are vigorous because they were created from vigour. The Vaiśyas are meant to be eaten, referring to their liability to excessive taxation, because they were created from the stomach, the receptacle of food. The Śūdra, because he was created from the feet, is to be the transporter of others and to subsist by the feet. In this particular account of the creation not only is the origin of the classes interpreted theologically, but also a divine justification is sought to be given to their functions and status. The creation-theory is here

further amplified to account for certain other features of these social classes. God is said to have created certain deities simultaneously with these classes. The Vaiśya class, the commoners, must have been naturally very large, and this account explains that social fact by a reference to the simultaneous creation of Viśvedevas, all and sundry deities, whose number is considerable. We are told that no deities were created along with the Śūdra and hence he is disqualified for sacrifice. Here again, the social regulation which forbade a Śūdra to offer sacrifice is explained as an incidental consequence of the creation.[1]

The fact that the four classes are described as of divine origin, although in a later hymn, must be taken as a sufficient indication that they were of long duration and very well-defined, even though the exact demarcation of their functions, the regulations guiding their inter-relations, and the extent of their flexibility may not be referred to in the main body of the Rigvedic literature, which is avowedly of a liturgical nature.

The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa lays down different sizes of the funeral mound for the four classes. The terms of address are also different, varying in the degree of politeness. In the "Human Sacrifice" the representatives of these orders are dedicated to different deities. A passage in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa warns a Kshatriya to avoid certain mistakes in the sacrificial ritual. If he commits a particular mistake, it goes on to say, "one like a Brahmin shall be born in his line who in the second or third generation from his has the power of becoming a Brahmin, and likes to live as a Brahmin." Similarly for two other mistakes he shall have a Vaiśya-like and a Śūdra-like son capable of becoming a full-fledged Vaiśya or Śūdra in two or three generations. It is clear, that though the classes had come to be almost stereotyped by the end of the Vedic period, it was not altogether impossible for an upward or downward change to occur in a particular family in two or three generations.[2]

These classes or orders are regularly referred to in later

literature as varṇas, so much so, that popularly Hindu religion has come to be defined as Varṇāśrama Dharma. Yet in the Rigveda the word "varṇa" is never applied to any one of these classes. It is only the Ārya varṇa, or the Aryan people, that is contrasted with the Dāsa varṇa. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, on the other hand, describes the four classes as the four varṇas.[3] "Varṇa" means "colour", and it was in this sense that the word seems to have been employed in contrasting the Ārya and the Dāsa, referring to their fair and dark colours respectively. The colour-connotation of the word was so strong that later on when the classes came to be regularly described as varṇas, four different colours were assigned to the four classes, by which their members were supposed to be distinguished.

On the relations subsisting between the four classes the Rigveda has very little to say. The inferences that we can draw are also few. Rigvedic literature stresses very strongly the difference between the Ārya and the Dāsa, not only in their colour but also in their speech, religious practices, and physical features. The Brahmin class, by the end of the period, appears to have acquired almost all the characteristics of a caste. Though the general body of the Rigvedic evidence is not quite determinative, yet a stray reference to a false claim for being regarded a Brahmin, like the one contained in the seventy-first hymn of the tenth book of the Rigveda points to this conclusion. The Brahmin is definitely said to be superior to the Kshatriya, whom he is able to embroil with his incantations or with his knowledge of rituals. He is said to ensure a king's safety in battle by his prayers and the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa lays down that a king's offerings are not acceptable to the gods unless they are offered with the help of a Purohita (chaplain), who, as we shall later on see, was generally a Brahmin. Wherever it is necessary, as in the Rājasūya sacrifice, for the Brahmin to pay homage to the king, the fact is explained in such a way as not to affect the superiority of the Brahmins. It is even suggested that the king rules by the authority delegated to him by the Brahmin.[4] The power of the king or the nobles to harass

a Brahmin is recognized and as an antidote a speedy ruin is threatened. The necessity of co-operation between the Brahmin and the Kshatriya for the complete prosperity of both is often reiterated. The Brahmins are declared to be gods on earth. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa even sums up the rights and duties of the Brahmins, amongst which receiving gifts and observing purity of descent are mentioned. It is also said that no Brahmin should accept whatever has been refused by others, and the sanctity attaching to the Brahmin is carried so far in the Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa as to foreclose any inquiry into his claim to Brahminhood. It appears from a passage in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that property of a Brahmin was exempt from the royal claim. The remains of the sacrificial food must be eaten by nobody but a Brahmin. According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the murder of a Brahmin is alone a real murder, while the Yajurveda declares it to be a more heinous crime than that of killing any other man. It could only be expiated by a heavy ritual. In a legal dispute between a Brahmin and a non-Brahmin an arbitrator or a witness must speak in favour of the former. Though the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa enumerates freedom from being killed as a privilege of the Brahmins, the Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa declares that a Purohita might be punished with death for treachery to his master. According to a legend in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the Brahmins regarded themselves as the spreaders of civilization.

The functions of a Brahmin may be said to be teaching and officiating at sacrifices, and his aim was to be pre-eminent in sacred knowledge. To achieve this, a student's life (Brahmacharya) was enjoined. To this course, it seems, only Brahmins were generally admitted. The story of Satyakāma Jābāla makes this quite clear. This youth went to a famous Brahmin teacher, requesting to be admitted as a pupil. The teacher asked him to give particulars of his lineage, whereupon Satyakāma is represented to have told the sage that he did not know the name of his father as he was born to his mother when she was overburdened with work. The teacher thereupon acclaimed him as a Brahmin

because he told the truth, and allowed him to be his pupil. It must be inferred from this anecdote that according to this teacher at least, only Brahmins could be admitted to Brahmacharya-studentship, because Satyakāma was accepted as a pupil only when the teacher was satisfied that the boy was a Brahmin. The test of lineage was subordinated here to the criterion of the moral characteristic of truth-speaking. Incidentally it may be pointed out that according to the ideas of the age only Brahmins could be expected to speak the truth. This inference fundamentally conflicts with the general comment on this story that it proves the possibility of a non-Brahmin being allowed to acquire the sacred lore. That members of other classes could be admitted to studentship as special cases must be inferred from the fact that in the Kāṭhaka Samhitā a rite is referred to for the benefit of a person, who has mastered the lore, though himself not a Brahmin. The priest's profession was perhaps hereditary, as we read of a Brahmaputra in a few passages as the son of a Brāhmaṇa (a priest) and also of a Brahmabandhu (a priest in name only). Nevertheless there are indications, corroborated by later tradition, that members of the Kshatriya class could also be priests. The expression "Brahmapurohita", meaning "having a Brahmin priest as Purohita", suggests the possibility of a non-Brahmin priest. Viśvāmitra, the chaplain of Sudāsa and the famous rival of Vasiṣṭha, according to the tradition, was a Kshatriya. Yāska tells us that Devāpi, who officiated as priest at his brothers' sacrifice, was a prince of the Kuru family. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa regards a Brahmin as impure if he follows the profession of a physician.

Whether marriage among the Brahmins was hemmed in by endogamous restrictions is not quite clear from the literature of this age. According to tradition, Chyavana and Śyāvāśva, two Vedic sages, married Kshatriya girls. On the other hand, the importance of pure descent was appreciated in so far as stress was laid on being a descendant of a Rishi. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, Kavasha is taunted with being the son of a female slave and in the Pañchavimśa Brāhmaṇa

Vatsa is represented as having cleared himself of a similar charge.

The second order in society, the Kshatriya, is known in the later portions of the Rigveda as the Rājanya. The class seems to have included only the chiefs and the nobles as the word "rājanya" points to the ruling activities, and thus brings out the functional origin of the class.[6] Usually the class is represented as inferior to the Brahmin, but a solitary reference in the Kāthaka Samhitā raises the Kshatriya over the Brahmin. In another text, "rājakula" or the king's family, is ranked after the Brahmin family. The phrase, "claiming falsely Kshatriya's rank," occurring in the Rigveda (vii, 104, 13), raises the presumption that the Kshatriyas constituted a compact class.

The occupations of the class, as we have mentioned above, must have consisted in administrative and military duties, though the rank and file of the army might have been formed even by the commoners. In the prayer for the prosperity of a Kshatriya, he is said to be an archer and good chariot-fighter. That members of this class could follow other occupations is rendered probable by the mention of a Rājanya as playing on the flute in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. According to later tradition, some of the composers of the hymns of the Rigveda belonged to this class. The few examples of Kshatriyas acting as priests are mentioned above. It is clear from Upanishadic literature that some of the kings of the age were not only the patrons of philosophers but were themselves well versed in the profound philosophical speculations of their times. Janaka of the Videhas, Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, Ajātaśatru, and Aśvapati Kaikeya are some of the conspicuous names of philosopher-kings. It seems that some of the Kshatriyas, though as a class they followed other professions, had kept themselves quite alert and abreast of their Brahmin brethren. The forward and daring spirits amongst them tried to assert their equality with the Brahmins both in priestcraft and in philosophical disquisitions. The conclusion seems to be legitimate, therefore, that only when

the ritual later on became too elaborate, and the Kshatriyas, on the other hand, became engrossed in the work of conquest, and progressively lost intimate contact with the older dialect, that they receded from the competitive field though only to rise in open rebellion against the Brahmins.

While there are a few traditional examples of Kshatriya girls being married to Brahmins, there is not a single example among the personages of this age where a Brahmin girl has married a Kshatriya. Though the Kshatriyas sometimes gave their daughters in marriage to Brahmins yet they seem to have had an objection to marry girls from even prosperous families of the two lower orders.

The third order in society, namely the Vaiśya, figures singularly little in Vedic literature. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa describes him as tributary to another, "to be lived upon by another," and "to be suppressed at will". Representing the common people, both the composition and the functions of this class are shadowy. According to the Taittirīya Saṁhitā, the greatest ambition of a Vaiśya was to be the "Grāmaṇī" or the village headman. "The son of a Vaiśya woman is never anointed a king," so says the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[7] Though, in comparison to the higher classes, the Vaisyas' position was rather insignificant, yet the class was definitely marked off from the Sudras.

The name of the fourth class, the Śūdra, occurs only once in the Rigveda. It seems the class represented domestic servants, approximating very nearly to the position of slaves. The Śūdra is described as "the servant of another", "to be expelled at will", and "to be slain at will". The Pañcha-vimśa Brāhmaṇa defines this position still more precisely when it declares that the Śūdra, even if he be prosperous, cannot but be a servant of another, washing his superior's feet being his main business. Yet according to the same work some of the king's ministers were Śūdras. The milk to be used for fire-oblation was not allowed to be milked by a Śūdra. He was not to be addressed by a person consecrated

for a sacrifice. He is declared to be unfit for sacrifice and not allowed even to be present in the hall where the sacrifice was being offered. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa goes to the length of declaring that the Śūdra is untruth itself.[8] Illicit connection between an Ārya male and a Śūdra female is mentioned, and the uneasiness felt by the Śūdra husband whose wife is a mistress of an Ārya is also hinted at.[9] In this connection we may mention that Vasishṭha quotes a Brāhmaṇa text to the effect that a woman of the black race, meaning the Śūdra people, was meant only for enjoyment and not for furtherance of any higher motives.[10]

We have seen that in the Rigveda a marked distinction was drawn between the Ārya and the Dāsa. In the later Vedic literature this demarcation tends to be drawn between the Ārya and the Śūdra, who is being described as of dark colour. As if to preserve the memory of this change, as a part of sacrificial rites a mock-fight between an Ārya and a Śūdra, in which the former necessarily wins, is prescribed. This change is perhaps due to the increasing association between the Aryan people and the Indian aborigines resulting in illicit unions not only between Ārya males and Śūdra females but also between Śūdra men and Ārya women.

Besides the four orders are mentioned in the Rigveda, occupations like blacksmith, leather-worker, barber, physician, goldsmith, merchant, and chariot-builder. We do not know which of these occupations were comprised in any of the four orders, nor can we say that each of them constituted a separate class. We know for certain that the status of the Rathakāra—the chariot-builder—was high enough to preclude his being classified with the Śūdras. The formulae for placing the sacrificial fire include one for the Rathakāra, indicating his high status even in religious matters.

It is not only the variety of occupations that is striking, but also the fact that one and the same occupation bore different names. The husbandman and potter have each more than one appellation. We have seen above that two

groups, following the same occupation, have different names and are recognized as independent castes or sub-castes. Naming is the first step towards distinction. We should, therefore, attach due significance to the fact of one and the same occupation being given different names, either through individual or provincial peculiarities, in the Vedic literature.

That some of the occupations at least had become hereditary is probable. The use of the patronymic, derived from the name of an occupation, lends support to this view, "kaulāla," "dhaivara," "pauñjishṭha," and "vāṇija" are used in the sense of the son of a kulāla (potter), of a "dhīvara" (fisherman), of a "puṇjishṭha" (fisherman), and of a "vaṇij" (merchant).

Four names occurring in the Vedic literature, viz. Āyogava, Chaṇḍāla, Nishāda, and Paulkasa, deserve more than passing notice. A king, named Marutta Āvikshita, is called the Āyogava. The meaning of the word is doubtful, but it must be pointed out that in the literature of the next period it is regularly given as the name of one of the mixed castes. The references to the Chaṇḍālas in the Yajurveda clearly show them to be a degraded people. In the next period, it will be seen, Chaṇḍālas are invariably described as the offspring of a Śūdra father and a Brahmin mother. Whether their degraded position in the Vedic period was due to such mixed descent is more than can be ascertained. At the same time the possibility of such an explanation must not be wholly overlooked, inasmuch as illicit connection between a Śūdra male and an Aryan female is sometimes hinted at. But the more plausible explanation would be that the Chaṇḍālas were a degraded group of aborigines. In the first place, it is difficult to see how a whole people could be the outcome of illicit unions between Aryan females and Śūdra males. Secondly, they are not the only group described as degraded people in the Vedic literature. The Paulkasas and Chaṇḍālas are referred to as a despised race of men in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. This use of a derivative noun from Pulkasa shows the fixity of the group. The term also occurs in later

literature as the name of the offspring of a Nishāda or Śūdra by a Kshatriya woman. Such a connection of Kshatriya females, as a regular feature, is much more than can be believed. It is more reasonable to hold that both these groups, Chaṇḍāla and Paulkasa, were sections of the aborigines that were, for some reason or another, particularly despised by the Aryans. The Nishādas, on the other hand, seem to have been a section liked by the Aryans, probably because they were amenable to their civilized notions. The Vedic expression "pañchajanāh" is explained by tradition, belonging to the latter part of this period, to mean the four varṇas and the Nishādas, a fact which shows that these people had, by this time, become quite acceptable to the Aryans. This conclusion is also borne out by a text of the Kaushītakī Brāhmaṇa requiring the sacrificer in a particular rite to reside temporarily with the Nishādas. It seems that the Vedic Dāsa, by constant association and slow assimilation, had been partially differentiated into the Śūdra and partially into the Nishāda, while the refractory and incorrigible elements were specially despised and styled Paulkasa and Chaṇḍāla.

We have seen that the three classes of the early portion of the Rigveda were later solidified into four groups, more or less compact, with three or four other groups, separately mentioned. Though these groups were very nearly exclusive units, upward or downward march of individuals was not altogether an impossibility, though it must have been an infrequent occurrence. Only the first three orders may be said to have been recognized as far as religious and ritualistic life was concerned. The Śūdra, though he was received within the precincts of the Aryan fold, was systematically debarred from following the religious practices of the Aryans. Nay, the ideas of untouchability were first given literary expression in connection with the Śūdras and the sacrifice. There were also various inequalities in the matter of religious practices between the other three classes. The impression is clearly gained that only the Brahmin and the Kshatriya were the two important orders in the society. The

former was steadily gaining exclusive influence with the increasing complexity of the sacrificial ritual, while the latter produced, only off and on, individuals capable of keeping themselves abreast of the former. It was in keeping with this that the third order, Vaiśya, was spoken of as the taxable group, and the fourth order, Śūdra, was denied any justice. Each order seems to have been habitually endogamous though occasionally Brahmins married Kshatriya females, and all the three higher orders now and then might have kept Śūdra mistresses. There was a variety of specialized occupations about which we have no means of ascertaining whether they were included in one or the other of the four orders. They seem to have been hereditary rather by custom than by regulation. The prohibition of dining in the company of others is not laid down in connection with these orders, though the general idea is there. It is only those who were performing a certain rite or who believed in a certain doctrine that were forbidden to dine in the company of others.[11]

The Brahmanic literature of the post-Vedic period, while reiterating that there are only four varṇas, mentions certain mixed castes (saṅkara jāti) and also a group of outcast classes (antyāvasāyin). The sacred laws of the Aryas are designed to expound "varṇa-dharma", i.e. the duties ostensibly of the four orders. The text-books of the different schools may broadly be analysed into four parts. The first part, generally very short, deals with the "āśramas" (four stages in individual life) and their duties; the second part, forming a large portion of the book, really deals with "varṇa-dharma". Much of the law proper is treated in this section under the heading, "duties of the Kshatriya". The two other parts deal with expiatory acts and inheritance. Though the main bulk of the law is treated under "varṇa-dharma", yet the "Śūdra" does not figure much in these texts. The "varṇa-dharma" of the "Śūdra" is such that it does not require elaborate regulation. It may justly be said that the "Śūdra" was left to himself as far as his internal affairs were concerned. Mandlik observes, "The non-regenerate class thus

seems to form a group by itself, and its internal economy is not specially provided for by the ordinary Ārya writers on law."[12] Their case is provided for by the general dictum, fathered on Manu, that the peculiar laws of countries, castes, and families may be followed in the absence of sacred rules.[13] The other classes are considered derivative, and therefore so much beneath notice that only forefold humanity is always alluded to and prevention of the confusion of these castes (varṇa-saṅkara) is considered as an ideal necessity.[14] Mixture of castes is regarded to be such a great evil that it must be combated even though the Brahmins and the Vaiśyas have to resort to arms, a function which is normally sinful for them.[15] As the outcasts were deprived of the right to follow the lawful occupations of the twice-born men, and after death, of the rewards of meritorious deeds,[16] it follows that the law-givers had no concern for them. They were enjoined to live together and fulfil their purposes, sacrificing for each other and confining other relations to themselves.[17] Of the mixed castes those that were the outcome of hypergamous unions, were proposed to be treated in two different ways. Gautama excludes from the brahmanic law only the issue of a Śūdra female by males of the first three orders.[18] It is not clear how he would like to treat the remaining three possible groups. Persons born of unions in the inverse order of castes—technically known as the 'pratiloma' (reverse) castes—are, of course, outside the pale of the sacred law, with the possible exception of one, viz. the Sūta.

Among the four varṇas, the old distinction of Ārya and Śūdra now appears predominantly as Dvija and Śūdra, though the old distinction is occasionally mentioned. The first three varṇas are called Dvijas (twice-born) because they have to go through the initiation ceremony which is symbolic of rebirth. This privilege is denied to the Śūdra who is therefore called "ekajāti" (once-born).[19] The word "jāti" which is here used for "varṇa", henceforward is employed more often to mean the numerous sub-divisions of a "varṇa". It is also the vernacular term for a "caste". A rigorous demarcation of meaning between "varṇa" and "jāti", the former denoting

the four large classes and the latter only their sub-divisions, cannot, however, be maintained. The word is sometimes indiscriminately used for "varṇa".

This period sees a great consolidation of the position of the Brahmin class, while the degradation of the Śūdras comes out in marked contrast to the growing superiority of the Brahmins. The discomfiture of the Kshatriyas is complete, and the Vaiśyas, at least the general mass, have progressively approximated to the Śūdras. The first indication of the appreciation of the Brahmin's position is to be found in the implication underlying the sacred law that in strictness its dictates are meant primarily for the Brahmins. Vasishṭha quotes some Vedic texts to inculcate the view that a Brahmin is born with three debts, viz. to the gods, to the manes, and to the sages. The discharge of these debts was to be achieved through sacrifices, progeny, and Vedic studies. These are fulfilled through the life of a student and of a householder. According to the philosophy of life current in this period, these debts should have been common to the Kshatriya and the Vaiśya, yet it is only the Brahmin that is singled out as pre-eminently the one varṇa on whom the discharge of these debts was incumbent. The three lower castes are ordered to live according to the teaching of the Brahmin, who shall declare their duties, while the king is exhorted to regulate their conduct accordingly.[20]

The importance of sacrifices and ritualism had been growing and with it the prestige of the priest. The privilege of officiating at sacrificial sessions and other religious rites was exclusively preserved as a divinely appointed and hereditary function of the Brahmins. As the monopolist of ritual procedure, the Brahmin naturally became important. In another way also, he gained in respect because he fulfilled a very fundamental function in the general philosophy of life of these times. As the Mahābhārata has it, "sacrifice sustains both the manes and the gods,"[21] and the Brahmin alone could ensure the proper performance of sacrifices. He was further represented as very beneficial to the political

head of the society. Vasishṭha quotes a Vedic text, declaring that the king obtains the sixth part of the merit which Brahmins accumulate by means of their sacrifices and good work.[22] Gifts had been praised since the Vedic times, and in the literature of this period, they were enjoined as a moral duty, the performance of which brought merit to the giver. "He who, placing on the skin of a black antelope, sesamum, gold, honey, and butter, gives it to a Brahmin over-comes all sin."[23] Āpastamba declares that a king, who without prejudice to his servants gives land and money to deserving Brahmins, gains endless heavenly worlds. The Brahmin alone could rightfully accept the gifts. As a channel of easy acquisition of merit he thus gained added importance. "The offering made through the mouth of a Brahmin, which is neither split nor causes pain (to sentient creature) nor assails him (who makes it), is far more excellent than an agnihotra."[24] All these circumstances and the growing unintelligibility of the scriptural language conspired to make the Brahmin almost a god on earth. The pre-eminence of the Brahmin was so great that the Mahābhārata declared that really speaking there was only one "varṇa," viz. the Brahmin and the other varṇas were merely its modifications.[25] Though Gautama quotes the Vedic texts which declare that the Kshatriyas assisted by the Brahmins prosper, and that the union of the two alone upholds the moral order, yet he lays down that when a king and a Brahmin pass along the same road the road belongs to the Brahmin and not to the king.[26] Vasishṭha declares that the Brahmin's King is Soma.[27] The Mahābhārata goes even further, and emphasizes the subordinate position of the Kshatriya, whose only support is pronounced to be the Brahmin. It explains away earthly sovereignty of the Kshatriya by a social analogy. Just as a widow takes to her deceased husband's brother, so has the earth resorted to the Kshatriya in default of the Brahmin. Between a hundred year old Kshatriya and a ten year old Brahmin the latter is said to be like the father.[28] And this in a society where age was the greatest consideration for respect.[29] The superiority of a child-Brahmin over an aged Kshatriya is also supported by Āpastamba.[30] It is thus clear

that the union of the Brahmin and the Kshatriya that was advocated by Gautama must be understood to mean not an alliance between two equals but a tacit domination of the former over the latter.

This pre-eminence of the Brahmin had secured him many social privileges. According to Gautama, all varṇas must serve their superiors,[31] which meant that the Brahmin, as the most superior among the varṇas, was entitled to the services of the others. Naturally the Brahmin recognized no teacher who was not a member of his varṇa. It was only in times of distress that he was allowed to study under a non-Brahmin teacher, whom he surpassed in venerability on the completion of his studies.[32] This was against the general notions of respectability according to which the teacher must always be venerated by his pupils. The Brahmin might follow no gainful activity, yet as long as he continued the study of the Vedas, he was said to have fulfilled his purpose.[33] The Brahmin was exempt from the usual taxes.[34] If a Brahmin, who followed his lawful occupations, found a treasure, he had not to hand it over to the king.[35] Both the person and the property of the Brahmin were absolutely inviolate. Stealing the gold of a Brahmin and killing a Brahmin were regarded as heinous sins (mahāpātaka).[36] Raising one's hand or weapon in anger against a Brahmin, actually striking him, causing blood to flow from his body, unintentionally killing him, and wilfully murdering him were offences in the ascending order of their heinousness.[37] Wilful murder of a Brahmin was, of course, inexpiable. The Brahmin was exempt from corporal punishment.[38] The estate of heirless persons of the Kshatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra varṇas went to the king, who had to distribute it among learned Brahmins, while the estate of an heirless Brahmin belonged directly to them.[39] The property of a Brahmin is described as the worst poison destroying him who takes it.[40] On the other hand, in order to defray the expenses of a marriage or of a religious rite, he may help himself to the money of a Śūdra by fraud or by force. He may do the same with the property of those members of the other varṇas who neglect

their religious duties.[41] Even to accuse a Brahmin of a crime that he might have committed is a sin.[42] He must not be forced to be a witness at the instance of a non-Brahmin unless he is already mentioned in the plaint.[43] Even as regards the highly lauded and essential duty of a house-holder, viz. hospitality, the Brahmin has his privileges. He need not treat a non-Brahmin as his guest unless he comes on the occasion of a sacrifice.[44]

Though the various privileges of the Brahmins are sanctioned by the lawgivers, they insist from time to time that the Brahmin shall keep to the moral discipline of his class and conscientiously perform the duties laid down for him. They declare that a Brahmin who deviates from this path is equal to a Śūdra and as such there can be no harm in neglecting him.[45]

The statement that God created the Śūdra to be the slave of all is repeated and he is given the name "pādaja" (born from the feet). He is to be supported, to be fed, to be clothed with the remnants and castaways of food and raiment by the three varṇas.[46] He is contrasted with the Ārya, who, though younger than he, must be respected by him by rising from his seat.[47] Whereas in the Vedic period, as we have seen, the Dāsa was described as the black race, in this period the Śūdra is given that appellation.[48] Vasishṭha declares him to be a burial ground. The Veda must not be recited in his presence, no advice must be given to him, nor the remnants of the offerings to the gods. Holy law must not be expounded to him, nor must he be asked to perform a penance.[49] He shall use the old shoes, discarded garments, etc., of the members of the other varṇas, and eat the leavings of their food.[50] So great was the feeling against the Śūdra performing a sacrifice that Gautama exhorted a person to cast off his father if he either sacrificed with the money given by a Śūdra or officiated at his sacrifice.[51]. It is well known that in the story of the Rāmāyaṇa, Rāma is represented to have killed a Śūdra who was practising austerities.[52] The Śūdra was regarded to be so despicable, that a Brahmin,

when, out of sheer necessity, he had to take up the Śūdras' occupation, was asked not to mix with them.[53]

It is clear that the Śūdra could not perform a sacrifice, could not listen to or recite the Vedic texts, nor could he practise austerities. He was categorically denied the right of initiation and consequently the first stage of individual life (āśrama) the studentship. Out of the other sacraments marriage is the only one, which is explicitly applicable to the Śūdras. While laying down their duties Gautama observes: "For him (Śūdra) also (are prescribed) truthfulness, meekness, and purity. Some declare that instead of sipping water (the usual method of purification) he shall wash his hands and feet. (He shall also offer) the funeral oblations."[54] Āpastamba opines that the Śūdra is not entitled to the rite of initiation, the study of the Veda, and the kindling of the sacred fire. His works (rites) are declared by implication to be unproductive of rewards either in this world or in the next.[55] According to Gautama, the Śūdra, if permitted, may use "namah" (obeisance) as his "mantra" (holy incantation). He states that some allow him to offer Pākayajñas[56] (minor sacrifices to be offered in the fire kept at home, as distinguished from major sacrifices offered in the Śrauta or Vedic fire). The Mahābhārata also takes the same view of the Śūdra's religious duties. A Pākayajña may be offered on his behalf without his being initiated for it. Ample Dakshiṇā (fees) seems to be a prominent feature of such sacrifices offered by the Śūdras, of whom one named Paijavana is said to have given away by thousands.[57] It is apparent from these data that the Śūdra had no right to perform any of the important sacraments. As he could not kindle the sacred fire, his marriage was certainly not regarded as a sacrament, intended for the fulfilment of religious duties but only as a sexual union. As the minor sacrifices called the Pākayajñas were to be offered in the domestic sacred fire, and as we have seen above the Śūdra had no right to kindle this fire, we cannot attach much significance to the permission given to the Śūdra to offer these sacrifices. It only means that the Brahmin was not entirely unwilling

to open up certain channels through which fees might flow to him, even though the donor might be a Śūdra. It may be mentioned that even the Dasyus were encouraged to offer such sacrifices.[58] The utter indifference shown to the Śūdra is further brought out by the fact that out of the eight forms of marriage the two forms recommended for the Śūdra are entirely devoid of religious content. In fact, one of them may be termed rape as consummated marriage, and the curious justification offered for this prescription is that the Śūdras are not particular about their wives.[59].

I cannot agree with Professor Max Müller when he says that the Grihya Sūtras never expressly exclude the Śūdra from the rite of initiation.[60] The ages at which this rite was to be performed are laid down only for the three classes and not for the Śūdra. To me it appears that this is sufficient evidence that the Grihya Sūtras did not contemplate the initiation of the Śūdra. The initiation ceremony opened the door to the study of the Veda. The Śūdra has, throughout, been debarred from that study. He has never been allowed to hear Vedic recitations. How possibly could the Grihya Sūtras, under these circumstances, even dream of the Sūdra being initiated? The fact appears to be that undeserving as he was of this rite, he was simply ignored.

The Mahābhārata says that the Śūdra can have no absolute property, because his wealth can be appropriated by his master at will.[61] If the master of a Śūdra has fallen into distress, the latter shall be placed at the disposal of the poor master.[62] The king is enjoined to appoint only persons of the first three classes over villages and towns for their protection.[63] Śūdra trying to hear the Vedic texts shall have his ears filled with molten tin or lac; if he recites the Veda his tongue shall be cut off, and if he remembers it he shall be dismembered. If he assumes a position of equality with twice-born men, either in sitting, conversing, or going along the road, he shall receive corporal punishment.[64] A Śūdra, committing adultery with women of the first three castes, shall suffer capital punishment, or shall be burnt alive tied

up in straw.[65] If he intentionally reviles twice-born men or criminally assaults them, the limb with which he offends shall be cut off.[66] Āpastamba, too, lays down the same punishment, but only in the case where the assault is directed against a Brahmin.[67]. On the other hand, a Śūdra can be abused by a Brahmin without entailing any punishment.[68] A Snātaka (a Vedic student) is exhorted not to go on a journey alone in the company of a Śūdra.[69] For a Brahmin to eat the food given by a Śūdra is a sin that must be expiated; and to avoid taking it is one of the few things the practice of which assures a Brahmin of bliss in heaven.[70] Gautama goes further and forbids a Snātaka to accept water given by a Śūdra.[71] Though, as we shall see later on, marriage between a Brahmin male and a Śūdra female is contemplated, yet it is said that such a wife is espoused merely for pleasure and not for the fulfilment of a religious purpose.[72] Cohabitation with a Śūdra female is a sin, which a Brahmin must wipe out.[73] A Brahmin who marries a Śūdra wife and dwells for twelve years in a village, where only well-water is obtainable, becomes equal to a Śūdra.[74] A Śūdra committing adultery with an Aryan woman shall have his organ cut off and his property confiscated.[75] Altogether so unworthy is the Śūdra that, if he comes as a guest, he shall be fed together with one's servants and that, too, perhaps after getting some work out of him.[76]

The Śūdra, thus had no civil or religious rights. Nevertheless, there are sentiments of compassion about him expressed here and there. A master is exhorted to support his Śūdra servant when he is unable to work,[77] and to offer funeral oblation for him in case he dies childless.[78] Rarely, as in one case given by Āpastamba,[79] he is allowed to cook food, even though meant for a religious function, under the supervision of members of the other three classes. This extraordinary tolerance towards the Śūdra might have been dictated by the peculiar conditions prevailing in the south during the early migration of the Indo-Aryans.

Though theoretically the position of the Śūdras was very

low, there is evidence to show that many of them were well-to-do.[80] Some of them succeeded in marrying their daughters in royal families. Sumitrā, one of the four wives of king Daśaratha, was a Śūdra. Some of them even worked their way up to the throne. The famous Chandragupta is traditionally known to be a Śūdra. The Ābhīras who ruled over the Deccan for some time were, according to Patanjali's counting, a caste by themselves not included among the Śūdras, though they were not Kshatriyas.

The Vaiśya, though traditionally classed with the first two "varṇas," is grouped on many occasions with the Śūdras. As we shall see later on, the occupations ordained for these two classes are almost identical. Gain by labour is mentioned as a special mode of acquisition, both for Vaiśya and Śūdra.[82] Apart from this increasing similarity of occupations, the special occupations of the vaiśya were such that they could not be well defined. "The humblest tender of cows for a master may be of this caste, or the work may be done by one outside the Aryan ranks."[83] The Vaiśyas are understood to consist of labourers.[84] Kautilya leaves no doubt as to the equality of occupational status between the two castes. The Bhagavadgītā proudly proclaims that its religious doctrines can lead even the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras to salvation.[85] In this matter these two classes stand in marked contrast to the other two classes. We are led to believe that the Vaiśya, in spite of the injunction of the Brahmins that he should fulfil the duties prescribed for him in the sacred law, had so much fallen off that a less rigid and elaborate way of working out one's salvation was necessary for him. Out of the eight forms of marriage, the two prescribed for the Vaiśyas are the same as those recommended for the Śūdra. According to Vasishṭha when a Brahmin marries outside his varṇa, his sons by a Vaiśya and a Śūdra wife shall inherit equal shares.[86] Similarly only one common formula of welcome need be used for a Vaiśya and a Śūdra guest. Both of them are to be fed together with one's servants.[87] In the chaos that is supposed to have ensued after Paraśurāma had slaughtered the Kshatriyas, we are told that both the Śūdras

and the Vaiśyas discarded the Brahmanic rules of discipline and violated Brahmin females.[88] The moral of this story is clear. The Vaiśyas, like the Śūdras were ready, as soon as the strong ruling arm was off, to rebel against the Brahmanic rules of conduct. And the growth of Jainism and Buddhism, particularly their quick appeal to the Vaiśyas, fully corroborates this inference.

The theory of the divine origin of the four castes is off and on repeated with special stress on the origin of the Śūdra from the feet of the Creator. In the Mahābhārata once at least a slightly material change is introduced in this theory, where we are told that the first three castes were created first, and the Śūdra created afterwards for serving the others. Evidently this divine origin did not prove as comforting to the lower classes as could be desired in the interests of social order. Salvation of self had come to be the outstanding problem of the philosophy of life. If the performance of religious rites, as laid down by the sacred law, could alone lead to salvation, there was no hope for the Śūdra nor even perhaps for the Vaiśya, because the former was emphatically forbidden to perform these religious rites and the latter had progressively lost their practice. A philosophy of caste, guaranteeing individual salvation to all, through the performance of duties alone, had to be formulated. Such a theory was calculated to allay the unrest and quell the rebellion against caste that might arise owing to the unsatisfactory nature of the old theory as far as salvation, which had become the most absorbing human interest, was concerned. The Buddhistic religion, however much its followers stood by caste, was ready to declare that Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaiśya, Śūdra, and Chaṇḍāla would be all equal in the world of the gods, if they had acted virtuously in this life, and that a person's worth in life was determined by his right conduct and knowledge. The necessity of closing up the ranks against the onslaught of Buddhism and of assuring individual salvation for all led to the formulation of two slightly differing philosophies of caste.

Gautama observes: "Men of the several castes and orders who always live according to their duty enjoy after death the rewards of their works, and by virtue of a remnant of their merit, they are born again in excellant countries, castes, and families endowed with beauty, long life, learning in the Vedas, virtuous conduct, wealth, happiness, and wisdom. Those who act in a contrary manner perish, being born again in various evil conditions."[89] According to Āpastamba, sinful persons are born as low castes and even as animals. A person, for example, who steals a Brahmin's gold will be reborn as a Chaṇḍāla if he is a Brahmin, as a Pulkasa if he is a Kshatriya and as a Vaiṇa (a mixed caste) if he is a Vaiśya. Men of the lower castes are reborn in higher castes if they have fulfilled their duties, while men of the higher castes are born in the lower ones as a result of their neglect of the prescribed duties.[90] It is clear that according to this lawgiver conscientious practice of the duties proper to one's own varṇa, led to a birth in a higher varṇa and thus to salvation. Failure to act according to one's varṇa duties meant birth in a lower caste and finally spiritual annihilation. In the Mahābhārata, the upward march from one caste to another in succeeding births till a person is born a Brahmin is described in detail.[91]

In the Bhagavadgīta the Creator is said to have apportioned the duties and functions of the four castes according to the inherent qualities and capacities of individuals.[92] Of course, this theory fails to explain how the individuals at the very beginning of creation came to be possessed of peculiar qualities and capacities. This theory of origin, though it slurs over the above difficulty, tries to provide a rational sanction for the manifestly arbitrary divisions. God separated the people into four varṇas, not merely because they were created from different limbs of his body nor again out of his will, but because he found them endowed with different qualities and capacities. In so far as a justification is sought to be given for a social phenomenon, which was hitherto taken for granted, the Bhagvadgītā records a remarkable change in attitude. In conformity with this, the

life-philosophy preached in the book furnishes us with the other philosophy of caste referred to above. The whole episode which made the occasion for the enunciation of the new philosophy, the philosophy of duty, ends with the burden that an individual must do the duty proper to his varṇa. Arjuna, the hero, is dismayed and refuses to fight. Krishṇa, the preacher, ultimately persuades him to fight, and thus to do the duty proper to his Kshatriya varṇa. The work is a supreme effort to drive home the truth that man must perform the duties proper to his social state faithfully and truthfully and then salvation shall be his without doubt. No work is bad, impure, or sinful. It is only the way in which work is done that determines its worth. The peculiar way in which all work must be done is the way of dedicating it to God. The philosophy is beautifully illustrated in two episodes of the Mahābhārata: the one about Jājali, the trader, and the other about Vyādha, the butcher. We may compare a similar phenomenon from the social history of medieval Europe. R. H. Tawney observes: "The facts of class status and inequality were rationalized in the Middle Ages by a functional theory of society."[93]

This philosophy of caste takes the sting off the institution and thus skilfully stereotypes it. During the later ages, therefore, this theory of caste has been rightly harped upon. The differences between the Sūtra theory of caste, detailed above, and this theory is significant. The Brahmin authors of the Sūtras promised salvation to the Śūdra only through the intermediary of births in higher castes. In plain words it was tantamount to asking him to wait till doomsday. The mark of inferiority was permanently impressed on him, and his low status was declared by implication to render it impossible for him to work out his salvation in his own person. The concession granted testifies only to the liberalism of the writers on Dharma. The Gita, on the other hand, disarms opposition on more counts than one. First, it tries to provide a rationale for the original division into four varṇas. Secondly, it unequivocally asserts the virtual equality of these divisions as far as the value of their distinct

work and their inherent capacity for working out individual salvation are concerned.

We have seen that in the Vedic age Kshatriyas sometimes discharged the priestly functions and preached the higher philosophy. Viśvāmitra is one of those Kshatriyas who, according to later tradition, officiated as a priest. In the Rigveda, he and Vasishṭha, the Brahmin, are said to have been the priests of King Sudāsa at different times.[94] In the Epic literature, Vasishṭha, the Brahmin, and Visvāmitra, the Kshatriya, figure as opponents in many a story.[95] The principal cause of quarrel between them appears to be the desire of Viśvāmitra to reckon himself a Brahmin. On the one hand, wonderful powers of enabling his royal patrons to lead their sacrifices to a successful finish, are credited to Viśvāmitra and on the other great valour and military skill are attributed to him. Vasishṭha is described as a perfectly peaceful and learned Brahmin, able to complete the most difficult sacrifices as well as to meet the most deadly weapons of Viśvāmitra in the characteristic way of the Brahmins, viz. with the help of Brahmanic lustre. Reading these stories one cannot fail to get the idea that in the quarrel of these two individuals is epitomized the history of the rivalry between the first two castes. Though, in the end, Viśvāmitra won Brahminhood, yet Vasishṭha is represented as having defeated him on every count, not excepting even his martial skill. It seems to me that these stories were designed to teach a lesson to the Kshatriya that his physical prowess was futile before the spiritual force of the Brahmin. Viśvāmitra is made to remark, "Fie on the Kshatriya's strength. By the single brahmanic mace all my weapons are destroyed."[96] While the Brahmins of the Vedic age were content with making pious declarations that they were above the power of the king and addressing fervent exhortation that the Kshatriyas should work in union with the Brahmins, those of the later age were emboldened enough to draw a concrete picture of the utter futility of the Kshatriya's weapons against the spiritual prowess of the Brahmin. Though Viśvāmitra becomes a Brahmin in the end, the Kshatriya is crest-

fallen. His right to act as priest is very hard won. Viśvāmitra is allowed to become a Brahmin on the one condition that he renounces once for all his ways of the Kshatriyas, and through and through resorts to the methods of the Brahmins. No doubt he entered the Brahmin fold, but he could not open up the closed door to his erstwhile associates.

The Brahmins, as if not being content with showing the superiority of Brahmanic lustre over martial prowess, created in Paraśurāma, a Brahmin, who overpowered the Kshatriyas not by the usual Brahmanic weapon of spiritual force, but by their own military weapons. Paraśurāma is the champion of the Brahmins and avenges his father's murder on the Kshatriyas. He is represented as having destroyed the Kshatriya race in twenty-one campaigns. Though he wrests the control of the earth from the hands of the Kshatriyas, he is not prepared to rule over it. Everywhere chaos ensues, and the need for the strong arm to govern the people is keenly felt. According to one version of the story, on the retirement of Paraśurāma some of the Kshatriyas, who had stealthily escaped him, were encouraged to multiply and rule. According to another account, the Kshatriyas of the post-Paraśurāma age were all a mixed progeny of Kshatriya females and Brahmin males.[97] Two of the most skilled of the Kshatriya heroes of the Mahābhārata, namely, Bhīshma and Karṇa, were reputed to be the most favourite disciples of Paraśurāma, the Brahmin teacher of the Kshatriya's art. It is clear that the story of Paraśurāma owed its origin—and there are many discrepancies in this story to prove this contention—mainly to the desire of the Brahmins: first, to show that the Brahmin's wrong would not remain unavenged; second, to impress the fact that the Brahmins, if they took to arms, would prove themselves immensely superior to the Kshatriyas in warfare and last, to humiliate the Kshatriyas.

I concluded from my discussion that the Brahmin was, during the period, very strongly entrenched and that he had sufficiently subdued the Kshatriya. Henceforth the Ksha-

triya as a serious competitor of the Brahmin vanishes from the field. Nevertheless he has been mortified. And it is my contention, that having succumbed in the age-long struggle within the fold, he breaks away and raises the banner of revolt. Both Jainism and Buddhism appear to me to be movements started by Kshatriyas of exceptional ability preaching a new philosophy which were utilized by their immediate followers for asserting the social superiority of the Kshatriyas over the Brahmins. The Brahmin has a fresh cause for grudge. He comes forward as the saviour of the Vedic Brahmanic culture. It is the Brahmin general of the last king of the dynasty of Aśoka that murders his king and proclaims himself the ruler. His family, the Śuṅgas, not only ruled over a large part but offered stubborn resistance to the invading foreigners. The next dynasty, that of the Kāṇvas, too was a Brahmin family. The feeling of wrath is cherished long in the Deccan, where nearly three centuries after the first Śuṅga revolt a Brahmin king proudly records that not only did he uproot the foreigners but also did he humble the pride of the Kshatriyas.[98]

Whatever be the express statements about caste in the original preachings of Mahāvīra and Buddha, a close student of the early literature of these religious movements will feel convinced that the chief social aim of the writers was the assertion of the pre-eminence of the Kshatriyas. It is a well-known fact that no Jain Tīrthamkara was ever born in any but a Kshatriya family. In Buddhist literature there are several examples where the enumeration of the four castes is headed by the Kshatriya, the Brahmin coming next. Many a time the Kshatriyas aggressively put forward claims for prior recognition over the Brahmins. E. J. Thomas observes: "The claim of the Sakyas to belong to the best caste, that of the warriors, is well-known; and though in the discourses the Brahmins are treated respectfully, their claims are criticized and rejected."[99] To Buddha himself is ascribed the saying that along with the Kshatriyas the Brahmins take precedence over the other castes in the matter of marks of respect to be shown to one's social superiors.[100] A legend

tells us that Buddha in one of his previous incarnations, wavered as to whether he should be reborn as a Brahmin or a Kshatriya and decided in favour of the latter alternative as the Kshatriya class was then regarded as higher than the Brahmin. In one of Buddha's discourses there is a dialogue between Buddha and Ambaṭṭha, a Brahmin student, in which the latter is represented as having acknowledged the fact that a Kshatriya's son by a Brahmin wife would be recognized as a Brahmin by the Brahmins but not by the Kshatriyas, because the latter accorded equal status only to the full-blooded Kshatriyas.[101] Though the work Lalitavistara falls in the third period, some of its traditional statements may be taken as valid for this. According to it Bodhisattvas are not born in low families like those of Chandālas, Rathakāras, Veṇukaras or Pushkasas. They take birth only in families of the two classes of Brahmins and Kshatriyas. They choose either of the two classes for their birth according as the ruling order of the age prefers a Brahmin teacher or a Kshatriya one. Buddha's age being decidedly the age of Kshatriya teachers, he chose a Kshatriya family.[102]

The express ideas in the Buddhistic literature voice the feeling that caste has nothing to do either with material success in life or with reward after death. High caste is not protected from the effect of wrong doing, and to an ascetic caste ought to be a matter of utter indifference. One of the Jātaka-stories ends with the declaration from the Bodhisattva that the virtuous do not ask one about his birth if his piety is well known. A person's worth in life is determined by right conduct and knowledge.[103] Nevertheless, in the various anecdotes about Buddha's former lives an individual's status is regarded as fixed by his conduct and even sometimes by his birth. In a dispute between two youths as to whether a person is a Brahmin by birth or by his actions, Buddha is said to have given his decision in favour of the latter alternative.[104] Thus Buddha is represented as being inclined to accept the divisions, basing them only on the individual's actions and not on his birth. That he meant these divisions to be status groups and not mere names is

evident from another saying attributed to him, where the highest marks of social respect are claimed for the Kshatriyas and the Brahmins.[105] In actual practice it seems that birth determined an individual's status in society much more than the general remarks would lead us to expect. Nay, I am inclined to look upon this theorizing about the futility of caste-ideas as mere exhortations, similar to the theorizing of the Brahmins recorded in the Upanishads and the epic literature. Buddha, in one of his former lives, had a child by a courtezan who proposed that the child should be given the name of Buddha's father. Buddha is said to have thus reflected: "A child which is born of a low woman cannot possibly be given the family name."[106] A king was fraudulently made to marry a girl born of a Kshatriya father and a slave mother as if she were a blue-blooded Kshatriya. When the king perceived the deceit practised on him he complained to Buddha, who, while consoling him, observed: "The family of the mother does not matter; the family of the father alone is important." Buddha's attitude as typified in this remark is not radically different from the brahmanical doctrine. The king evidently does not seem to have been satisfied. He is represented as having divested his low-born wife of all queenly honours. It may be interpreted to be the general rule of the times that the daughter of a Kshatriya male and a slave female could not be recognized as a Kshatriya.[107] It is narrated in the introduction to one of the Jātakas how a Śākya-chief—the Kshatriya family in which Buddha himself was born—had great scruples about dining in the same plate with, or taking the food brought by his daughter by a slave woman.[108] In this connection it may also be pointed out that, according to later works dealing with Buddha's life, Buddha is never represented to have chosen any but the families of the two higher castes for his previous birth.[109] In the opinion of the great majority of the monks, caste distinctions had value even after persons had joined the brotherhood. Buddha does not countenance this view or practice.[110] From these facts we conclude that in the matter of caste-restrictions the preachings and actions of Buddha had only a general liberalizing effect. He does

not seem to have started with the idea of abolishing caste-distinctions, nor do his actions, as described in the Jātaka-stories, demonstrate an utter indifference towards the accident of birth; much less do they evince any conscious effort to annihilate caste. Fick has rightly observed that it is wrong to look upon Buddha as a social reformer and Buddhism as a revolt against caste.[111] And Sir Charles Eliot has summed up his judgement in the words "though he (Buddha) denied that Brahmans were superior by birth to others he did not preach against caste".[112]

Whatever might have been Buddha's own views and practice, it is indubitable that his early followers believed in the time-honoured restrictions of caste, and being most probably Kshatriyas themselves, utilized the opportunity, offered by Buddha's revolt, to establish Kshatriya pre-eminence among the four castes. The complete discomfiture of the Kshatriyas within the Brahmanic fold had made this course inevitable. Measuring their strength with the Brahmins and failing in the contest, they naturally turned their attention to the masses. In their appeal to the masses to recognize them as the real leaders of society, they must have availed themselves of the general opinion against the Brahmin and made an excellent use of the art of ridicule in drawing a ludicrous picture of the wide contrast between the Brahmin's professions and his practices.[113] Use of a language, better understood than Sanskrit by the populace, immensely helped them in their cause. It is just because this must have been the probable genesis of Buddhism that the largest bulk of its early followers were Kshatriyas and other well-to-do non-Brahmins who were dissatisfied with their low position within the Brahmanic fold.

1. Muir, i, p. 16.
2. Ibid., p. 439.
3. *Vedic Index*, ii. p. 247.
4. Compare *Śatapatha Brāhmana*, v, pp. 3, 4, 20.
5. *Chhāndogya-Upanishad*, iv, 4.
6. Macdonell and Keith observe : "It is significant that Rājanya is a variant to Kashtriya, and an earlier one" (Vol. I, p. 203).

7. Eggeling's translation, pt. v, p. 326.
8. Eggeling's trans., pt. v, p. 446.
9. Ibid., p. 326.
10. Infra, p. 91.
11. *Vedic Index*, ii, p. 257.
    Note : The above discussion is principally based on facts collected in the *Vedic Index*. Special attention may be drawn to the articles on Ārya, Brāhmaṇa, Chaṇḍāla, Dāsa, Kshatriya, Nishāda, Paulkasa, Śüdra, Vaiśya, and Varṇa.
12. Mandlik, p. 432.
13. Vasishṭha, p. 4.
14. Gautama, p. 212.
15. Baudhāyana, p. 236.
16. Ibid., p. 277.
17. Baudhāyana, p. 220.
18. Gautama, p. 197.
19. Vasishṭha, p. 9.
20. Vasishṭha, pp. 7, 8, 56.
21. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva.* 23-5, 72.
22. Vasishṭha, p. 8.
23. Vasishṭha, p. 135.
24. Vasishṭha, p. 139.
    The agnihotra has been the most fundamental and important ritual function that was enjoined on the first three castes since early Vedic times.
25. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 50, 59.
26. Gautama, p. 235. Āpastamba, pp. 124-5.
27. Vasishṭha, p. 8.
28. *Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana,* 12, 21-3.
29. Gautama, p. 208.
30. Āpastamba. p. 53.
31. Gautama, p. 231.
32. Ibid., p. 209.
33. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 14, 59.
34. Vasishṭha, p. 8.
35. Vasishṭha, p. 18
36. Vasishṭha, p. 5.
37. Baudhāyana, p. 212; Gautama, p. 279.
38. Gautama, p. 242; Baudhāyana, p. 201.
39. Gautama, p. 305; Baudhāyana, p. 179.
40. Baudhāyana, p. 180.
41. Gautama, p. 270.
42. Gautama, p. 279.
43. Gautama, p. 243.
44. Gautama. pp. 204-5.
45. Vasishṭha, pp. 16-18, 46; Baudhāyana, p. 248.

46. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 34, verses 31, 34, 36, 38, 59, 310.
47. Gautama, p. 206.
48. Āpastamba, p. 87; Vasishṭha, p. 96.
49. Vasishṭha, p. 95.
50. Gautama, p. 230.
51. Ibid., p. 274.
52. *Rāmāyana* (Nirnaysagar Ed.), *Uttarakāṇḍa,* vii, 4, 76.
53. Gautama, p. 211.
54. p. 230.
55. pp. 1-2.
56. p. 231.
57. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 59, 40-2.
58. Ibid.
59. Baudhāyana, p. 207.
60. *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (Panini Office edition, 1912), p. 106.
61. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 39, 59.
62. Gautama, p. 231.
63. Āpastamba, pp. 161-2.
64. Āpastamba, p. 165; Gautama, p. 236.
65. Āpastamba, p. 165; Vasishṭha, pp. 109-10; Baudhāyana, p. 233.
66. Gautama, p. 236.
67. Āpastamba, p. 165.
68. Gautama, p. 237.
69. Baudhāyana, pp. 217, 243.
70. Baudhāyana, pp. 224, 313.
71. Gautama, p. 76.
72. Vasishṭha. p. 96.
73. Baudhāyana, p. 313; Āpastamba, p. 84.
74. Baudhāyana, p. 244.
75. Gautama, p. 236.
76. Gautama, pp. 204-5; Baudhāyana, p. 239.
77. Gautama, p. 230.
78. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 59, 38.
79. Āpastamba, p. 103.
80. Compare the allusion to Paijavana and other wealthy Śūdras in the *Mahābhārata.*
81. loc. cit. I, 2, 72.
82. Gautama, p. 229.
83. *JAOS., vol. xiii,* p. 82.
84. Ibid., p. 83.
85. *Bhagavadgītā,* ix, 32-3.
86. p. 89.
87. Gautama, pp. 204, 205.
88. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva,* 48, 70.
89. p. 235.

90. pp. 102-3, 125.
91. *Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana Parva*, 4, 6.
92. *Bhagavadgītā*, iv. 13.
93. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, p. 22.
94. Muir, vol. i, p. 375.
95. Ibid.
96. *Rāmāyana* (Nirnaysagar Ed.), 56, 23.
97. Muir, i, p. 452.
98. Sarkar, p. 199.
99. Fick, pp. 17-19, 81-7; also vide Fausboll's translation of *Sutta-Nipāta*, pp. 23, 52, 75, 192; op. cit., p. 174.
100. Fick, p. 209.
101. *Ambaṭṭha-sutta, Dīghanikāya*, No. 3.
102. *Lalitavistara* (Lefmann's ed.), p. 20.
103. Fick, pp. 19-20, 28, 30.
104. Fick, pp. 220-1.
105. Fick, p. 209.
106. Fick, pp. 20-1.
107. Fick, pp. 56-7.
108. Fick, pp. 45-6.
109. Fick. p. 86.
110. Fick, p. 33.
111. Fick, p. 32.
112. loc. cit. I, XXII.
113. *Sutta Nipāta* (Fausboll's translation), pp. 46-51.

4

Caste Through the Ages—II

The post-Vedic period testifies to the rigid stratification and internal solidarity of the four varṇas. Each group was recognized as distinct, almost complete in itself, for its social life. Among the laws that were valid, provided they did not contradict the sacred precepts, are those of castes. Cultivators, traders, money-lenders, and artisans have authority to lay down rules for their respective classes."[1] It may be inferred that many of the sub-divisions within each varṇa—and undoubtedly by now there must have existed in each varṇa numerous sub-divisions—had rules of their own for their internal management. The word 'jāti' is applied by the great grammarian Patanjali to such ethnic groups as the Ābhīras, whom he declares to be other jāti than the Śūdra. By implication the Śūdras too were a 'jāti'. 'Varṅa' and 'jāti' would thus appear to be interchangeable terms. It is clear that other groups than the four traditional ones were not only in existence but had come to be recognized as jātis.[2]

The four castes were even supposed to be distinguished by their origin and particular sacraments.[3] When officers were chosen from all castes, their positions were to be so adjusted as not to disturb the caste-order of precedence.[4] A number of major and minor offences are also enumerated as leading to loss of caste.[5] Social intercourse, eating, and intermarriage seem to have been the visible marks of an individual's assimilation in his group.[6] Clearly these groups and sub-divisions must have had each its own internal organization to carry out effectively the avoidance of social intercourse, eating and intermarriage with their defaulting members. Adherence to prescribed duties was neither wholly left to the sweet will of the individual, nor was it only to

be enforced by the group. It was the duty of the king to see that the prescribed duties were performed by the proper individuals. If a man always neglected his prescribed duty and did what was forbidden, his property, with the exception of what was required for food and raiment, would be attached till he reformed his ways.[7]

The rules and regulations governing social life and individual conduct differed according to the orders in society, only the four 'varṇas' being taken into account by the law-givers. Others, like the mixed castes and outcastes, are mentioned, but their status in the eye of law and morals is not clearly defined. Even the Dharma was apportioned according to 'varṇa'. The Brahmin was entitled to the practice of the whole of it, the Kshatriya to three-fourths of it, the Vaiśya to half, and the Śūdra only to a quarter.[8] A Brahmin was to be initiated in his eighth year, a Kshatriya in the eleventh, and a Vaiśya in the twelfth.[9] A student, while begging alms, must use different formulae varying with his caste.[10] Of the eight forms of marriage only specific ones are enjoined for each caste. Where water is drunk for purification it must reach the heart, the throat, and the interior of the mouth in the case of the first three orders respectively. In case of the Śūdra it need touch only the extremity of the lips.[11] The higher the caste the shorter was the period of impurity to be observed at birth and death.[12] If a man of a lower varṇa carried the corpse of one of a higher caste or *vice versa*, the period of impurity was determined by the caste of the deceased. The higher castes had their cremation-grounds in different localities from those of the lower castes.[13] While asking a guest about his health, the terms to be used, according to the caste of the guest, were "kuśala" in the case of a Brahmin, "anāmaya" in the case of a Kshatriya, and "ārogya" in that of a Vaiśya and a Śūdra. A Brahmin must feed his Kshatriya guest after his Brahmin guests have had their meals. Other guests were to be fed together with one's servants.[14] In certain cases where a woman's husband had emigrated, the period of waiting prescribed for her varied according to her

caste, being the shortest for a Śūdra and the longest for a Brahmin female.[15]

Baudhāyana allows a sane man of any of the four castes to be a competent witness in a legal proceeding.[16] Vasishṭha's opinion is less decided. He observes: "Śrotriyas, men of unblemished form, of good character, men who are holy and love truth (are fit to be) witnesses. Or (men of) any (caste) may give evidence regarding (men of) any (other castes). Let him make women witnesses regarding women; for twice-born men, twice-born men of the same caste (shall be witnesses), and good Śūdras for Śūdras and men of low birth for low caste men."[17] If a Śūdra committed theft, he had to pay back eight times the value of the property stolen. In the case of a Vaiśya thief, the penalty was doubled. A Kshatriya had to pay twice as much as a Vaiśya and a Brahmin four times. If a learned man committed theft, the punishment was very much increased.[18] A man committing adultery with a woman of his caste had to undergo a certain penance.[19] Adultery with a woman of a higher caste entailed punishment, the severity of which increased with the caste-status of the woman violated.[20] It seems that illicit intercourse with females of lower castes by males of higher castes was not regarded in the nature of a serious offence. Only adultery with a low-caste woman was condemned as a heinous crime, the punishment for which was either banishment or degradation to the caste of the woman.[21] If a Brahmin killed a Brahmin, he was to be banished from the kingdom with the mark of a headless trunk branded on his forehead; but if a man of any of the other three castes committed the same offence, the punishment was death and confiscation of all his property. For slaying a Kshatriya, a Vaiśya and a Śūdra the fine was a thousand, a hundred, and ten cows respectively with a bull for the expiation of the sin in each case.[22] Even in the matter of taxation there seems to have been much inequality on the basis of caste. From Buddhist literature we gather that both the Kshatriyas and the Brahmins, though they owned the greater portion of the land, were free from taxes.[23]

The Śūdra generally was regarded as so low that his food might not be accepted by the Brahmin. There is one exception to this attitude of the lawgivers, and that is the permission given by Āpastamba for food being prepared by a Śūdra under the guidance of the higher varnas.[24] As I have suggested above this relaxation of the usual rule must have been necessitated by the special conditions of South India from which Āpastamba hailed. The same author lays down very strict rules in the matter of acceptance of food by a Brahmin student, who has completed his studies but has not yet entered the life of a householder. In his opinion such a person shall not eat in the houses of people belonging to the three lower castes. He quotes, but evidently does not approve of, the view that he may take food offered by persons of the two castes, next in order, who follow the prescribed rules.[25] Baudhāyana exhorts such a person to beg only uncooked food from the members of the first three castes and from the carpenters,[26] (lit. chariot-makers). He enjoins a Brahmin to eschew Śūdra's food. A Brahmin observing this rule is said to be the worthiest object of gifts. If the injunction is broken, dreadful consequences will follow both for the recalcitrant individual as well as for his progeny. Recitation of the Veda or offering of sacrifices cannot obliterate the evil effects of such action. A person who dies with a Śūdra's food in his stomach will be born again as a pig or a Śūdra. If after partaking of such food a Brahmin be so unwise as to have a conjugal intercourse, the offspring will belong to the Śūdra, and the Brahmin cannot ascend to heaven.[27] In another passage Vasishtha gives a list of persons whose food must not be eaten. They are the outcast, the Śūdra, the physician, the carpenter, the washerman, the cobbler, etc.[28] Gautama is more strict in his rule, and allows a Brahmin to eat the food, evidently cooked food, given only by such of the twice-born persons as are praised for the proper performance of their duties. But he differs from others in this that he recognizes the claims of some people, who are of the Śūdra class, for special treatment. The food offered by a herdsman, a husbandman, an acquaintance of the family, a barber, or a servant may be accepted.[29] A Brahmin may

also accept food at the hands of a trader who is not at the same time an artisan,[30] the latter's food being forbidden by Āpastamba to a Brahmin student returned home.[31] According to Gautama the food of a carpenter is also taboo to a Brahmin.[32]

The idea that certain persons defile, while others sanctify the company, if they sit down to a meal in one row, is present in the Śūtras.[33] In this idea may be discerned the origin of the later practice not to dine in the same row with people of other castes than one's own. Āpastamba enjoins a Brahmin student, who has returned home, not to eat sitting in the same row with unworthy people.[34]

The idea that an impure person imparts pollution by his touch and even by his near approach to a member of the first three castes finds definite expression in the law-texts of this period, generally with reference to the persons who are outcasted and even specifically in relation to a class of people called Chaṇḍālas. According to Gautama a man who is guilty of the crime of killing a Brahmin, must live outside the village, entering it only for alms. When he thus enters the village he must step out of the road on meeting a member of the first three castes and make the way clear for him.[35] On touching a Chaṇḍāla or one who has touched a Chaṇḍāla one must immediately bathe with one's clothes on.[36] If a Brahmin unintentionally eats the food or accepts the presents given by a Chaṇḍāla he is outcast. But if he does so knowingly he becomes equal to a Chaṇḍāla.[37] The position of the Chaṇḍālas must have been very degraded. A householder is exhorted to throw some food for them and the outcastes along with that for crows and dogs outside the house, after all the members of the household have taken their meals.[38] In marked contrast stands the practice of people about the 2nd century or even the 5th century B.C. For no less a careful student of linguistic usage than Patanjali, while explaining a rule in Panini's grammar, imparts us the valuable information that the Chaṇḍālas were considered to be a variety of Śūdras, not necessarily the last. That they were not out-

cast in the sense of having to live outside the limits of town or village is implied; and that they were outcast only as far as the use of their food-vessels by members of the twice-born orders was concerned is explicitly stated. They were the 'apapātra Śūdras' or simply 'apapātras', a term later used by Manu, too, about the Chaṇḍālas. The vessels used by them for taking their food could not be cleansed by any process to make them fit for use by the twice-born. This definite and clearcut information supplied by the great grammarian writing in about 150 B.C. is impliedly corroborated by the clever administrator Kautilya a few centuries later. The latter forbids the Chaṇḍālas to follow the custom of the Śūdras. By implication one may conclude that the Chaṇḍālas were for sometime at least following the customs of the Śūdras, because they were actually considered to be a variety of them.

Three of the Dharma Śūtra writers have used the term 'apapātra', but in such a manner as to imply that the people designated are different from Śūdras and sometimes from the Chaṇḍālas. But almost always they are exhorted to be treated like dogs and outcasts.[39] Āpastamba regards it as an offence even to speak to or to look at a Chaṇḍāla.[40] The outcastes are to live by themselves as a community, teaching each other and marrying among themselves. Association with them by pure men is prohibited on pain of excommunication. By association is meant either a matrimonial alliance, officiating at their sacrifice, or even touching them.[41] It seems that the ideas of pollution had progressed further than these examples lead us to believe. Continued use by the Śūdras of the water in a well rendered it unfit for religious purposes. This at least seems to be the opinion of Baudhāyana who says that a Brahmin, who marries a Śūdra wife and dwells in a village where only well-water is available, becomes equal to a Śūdra.[42] There are many stories in the Jātakas, illustrating the scrupulous avoidance of the proximity of persons belonging to a despised or even a very low caste. The fear of pollution was not entirely confined to the Brahmins, but sensitive females like the daughter of a

merchant in the story showed it in an excessive degree. The impurity of a person could also be imparted to objects touched by him[43] The Chaṇḍālas lived outside the town in a hamlet of their own, and it seems that the other low castes, mentioned together with them, like Pukkasa, Rathakāra, Nishāda, did likewise.[44]

The ideal theory of castes laid down certain duties as common to all of them and some as specific to each. Out of these some were prescribed as the authorized modes of gaining livelihood, and were generally peculiar to each caste and ordinarily forbidden to the others. The Brahmin must subsist on teaching and officiating as priest at the sacrifices of the castes that were entitled to offer such religious worship and by accepting gifts. The Kshatriya was to live by administration and the profession of arms. Agriculture, trade, and pastoral pursuits were to be exploited by the Vaiśya, while the one occupation prescribed for the Śūdra was service of the other castes.[45] In times of distress one might follow the occupation peculiar to the lower orders, but never that of the higher, and preferably the one prescribed for the caste next in status to one's own.[46] Gautama is more lenient than other lawgivers and allows a Brahmin to take to agriculture and trade as lawful occupations, provided he employs servants to carry on the actual business and does not do the work himself.[47] That the Brahmins engaged themselves in occupations other than the lawful ones, either out of necessity or even ordinarily, is clear from the injunction not to entertain at a Śrāddha-dinner Brahmins who follow the profession of Kshatriyas, or live by trade or by handicrafts.[48] When a Brahmin practises trade he is enjoined to abstain from dealing in certain articles. If he engages in agriculture, he must not yoke to his plough bullocks whose noses are pierced, nor must he plough after breakfast.[49] A few occupations like that of the carpenter, the charioteer, and the bard are assigned to some of the mixed castes that are described as the result of mesalliance between the four castes. It will be noticed that the theory of occupations as proper pursuits of specific castes does not accommodate the artisans. It is not

that there were no artisans in the society but that their status does not seem to have been definitized. Indeed, Gautama distinguishes the artisans from those who live by personal labour, the latter expression being understood by the commentator to denote labourers like carriers.[50] Nay, crafts were so much advanced that pure artisans, who did not deal in their handiworks, were distinguished from artisan-traders.[51] That even members of the Kshatriya caste did engage in agriculture and other pursuits, not proper for their class, is proved by the Kambojas and Saurāshtras, who, though they are described as corporations of warriors, lived by agriculture and trade as much as by the profession of arms.[52] In view of the later degradation of the artisans it is to be noted that Kautilya already describes them as of naturally impure character.[53]

In the Buddhistic literature many of the occupations are represented as having been hereditary and some of the classes like that of the Brahmin and the Gahapati, the representative of the Vaiśya, had definitely come to be regarded as such rigid castes that, though their members followed other occupations than those customary for their classes, they remained the members of their castes.[54] The Jātakas mention villages each of which consisted wholly of the followers of one occupation. Thus there were smiths' villages and potters' villages.[55] Some of the crafts are spoken of as low, e.g. that of the barber, who is also referred to as of inferior caste.[56] Though the Buddhistic evidence as regards the actual professions taken up by the contemporary Brahmins must be taken with some discount—it was but natural for the Buddhist writers to hold up to ridicule their opponents by depicting them as violators of their own precepts—yet it must be pointed out that the cultivating and cattle-rearing Brahmin is an oft-recurring figure in the Pāli texts and once even a Brahmin carpenter is mentioned.[57]

Though the orthodox theory of caste is stated in terms of only the broad categories of occupations, yet there are enough indications that in daily life further distinctions based

on specialization were recognized. Traders and craftsmen are mentioned in specific relation to their special merchandise and craft. Giving directions for laying out the plan of the environs of the royal palace within the fort, Kautilya enjoins the localization of trades and crafts in various quarters; and in this connection he mentions, as separate groups, dealers in grain, purveyors of liquids, dealers in cooked rice, those who sell flesh, manufacturers of cotton threads, workers in bamboo, workers in hides, makers of gloves, ironsmiths and artisans working in precious stones.[58] From the evidence of the Jātaka literature,[59] we may conclude that these specific occupations were hereditary in this period, though the Brahmanic theory of castes referred only to the larger categories. The Jātakas further bear testimony to the then incipient practice of naming sub-divisions of artisans on the basis of differences in the methods employed in carrying on the craft. Thus the fishermen who used nets and baskets were called "Kevattas" in contradistinction to "Bālisikas" who were angling fishermen.[60]

The lawgivers look upon marriage in one's own caste among the four orders as the most ideal and in a way the only sanctified practice, though they are prepared to recognize marriages outside the caste as perfectly lawful. Vasishtha and Gautama exhort a person about to enter on the life of a householder, to marry a female of one's own caste and the latter opines that it is only the virtuous sons, born of wives of equal caste, who are married in accordance with the approved rites, that sanctify their fathers' family.[61] Baudhāyana recognizes only the son by a wife of equal caste as a sapinda, sons by wives of other castes being not so reckoned.[62] But, probably in conformity with the practice of their day, these lawgivers allowed males of higher castes to marry females of lower castes, though they refused to allow the issue of such marriages equal rights with the sons of equal marriages. In the matter of inheritance, for example, the share of a son in his patrimony varied according to the caste-status of his mother.[63] The offspring of such unequal unions are said to belong neither to the caste of the father

nor to that of the mother but are relegated to separate classes, called the intermediate castes. The names of these castes as given by Gautama do not correspond to those given by Baudhāyana except in the case of the issue of the marriage of a Brahmin male and a Śūdra female.[64] In the case of the first three castes Baudhāyana declares that the offspring of a male of the higher caste and a female of the next lower caste are "savarṇās" or of equal caste. Consistently he gives the name of the issue of the marriage of a Brahmin with a Kshatriya female as a Brahmin, and that of the union of a Kshatriya male and a Vaiśya female as a Kshatriya. This seems to represent the old practice, when marriages between males of higher castes and females of castes next in order were regarded as perfectly regular and entailed no disqualification on the issue. For even Gautama calls the issue of the union of a Brahmin male and a Kshatriya female "savarṇa", though refusing to give a similar name to the progeny of a Kshatriya male and Vaiśya female. Kautilya's nomenclature of the mixed castes agrees with that of Baudhāyana except in the case of the issue of a Vaiśya male and a Śūdra female. But he designates the children of the unions of males of the Brahmin and Kshatriya castes and females of the Kshatriya and Vaiśya castes respectively as "savarṇas", and does not explicitly speak of them as Brahmins and Kshatriyas.

That restriction on such marriages was being newly put during this period is rendered probable by the fact that the rule clearly enunciated in the works of the next period, viz. that only a wife of equal caste can be a full and lawful participant in the religious ceremonies of her husband, does not find its counterpart in the legal literature of this period. The lawgivers, as we shall note below, disqualify for religious rites only a Śūdra wife. Nay, we have reason to believe that the still older practice contemplated unrestricted marriages of the males of the two highest castes with females of the two lower castes—Kshatriya and Vaiśya. It is said in the Mahābhārata that the sons of a Brahmin born of wives of the first three castes are Brahmins.

We may conclude that in olden days Brahmins could marry females from any of the first three castes and Kshatriya from their own and from among the Vaiśyas without any stigma. The lawgivers of this period restricted this custom. While some of them recognized marriages of males of higher castes with females of the next lower caste as unobjectionable, others confined this attitude to the marriage of a Brahmin with a Kshatriya female and regarded the marriage of a Brahmin or a Kshatriya with a Vaiśya female as outlandish. This view of marriage with a Vaiśya female might have been due to the progressive assimilation of the Vaiśya caste to the Śūdras.

Marriage with a Śūdra female, though theoretically allowed for all the castes, is discountenanced in many practical ways. First, even Baudhāyana, who looks with no disfavour on the marriage of a male of a higher caste with a female of the next lower caste, does not concede the social status of its father to the child of a Vaiśya by a Śūdra female. He calls it Rathakāra. Vasishṭha expressly forbids any of the first three castes to marry a Śūdra female. Such a union according to him leads to the degradation of the family in this life and to loss of heavenly bliss in the next.[66] He forbids a householder, who has built the fire-altar for a Śrauta sacrifice, to approach a Śūdra wife, for she is meant for pleasure and not for the fulfilment of the sacred duties. He quotes an opinion that the issue of a Brahmin male and a Śūdra female is as impure as a corpse.[67] Gautama places the claims of such offspring on a par with the rights of persons that are the issue of marriages between lower caste males and females of the higher castes because both of them are outside the pale of the sacred law.[68] Thus the lawgivers definitely set their face against the marriages of men of the first three castes with Śūdra females. This is the first pronounced restriction on marriage of the nature of endogamy in Hindu society.

The unions of males of lower castes with females of higher castes are contemplated and specifically treated. Yet

they are not at all countenanced. As a matter of fact, they are not marriages at all. The progeny of such unions is declared to be without the pale of the sacred law,[69] though the names of the different groups formed by them according to the difference in the caste of the father and the mother are given.[70] Such unions are so despised that their offspring, though their actual parentage may be unknown, are held capable of being singled out, because such persons certainly are destitute of virtue and good conduct.[71] Chaṇḍāla—the untouchable and unapproachable class of this period—is represented as the issue of the union of a Śūdra male with a Brahmin female.

The fresh groups, formed by the offspring of the unions of males of higher castes with females of the second lower castes, and those resulting from their unions, may intermarry and give rise to other castes. But these last mentioned mixed castes must marry among themselves.[72]

It seems reasonable to conclude that endogamy was being sought to be rigorously prescribed and was followed to a large extent, and that the writers were at great pains to explain the origin of so many different castes, which had sprung up either by miscegenation, local segregation, occupational specialization, or tribal incorporation, because the orthodox theory mentioned only four castes.

Fick summarizes the evidence of the jātakas thus. "Marriage within one's own 'jāti' (caste) was the rule. Everywhere in the jātakas we meet with the effort to keep the family pure through marriage confined to people of one's own standing and profession, and not to allow it to degenerate through mixture with lower elements. When the parents desire to marry their son they seek a maiden of the same caste for him." Yet there are instances in the jātakas where the barriers of caste against intermarriage are surmounted. Endogamy was rather a universal custom than a rigid rule of caste.[73]

Gautama is the one amongst the lawgivers who recognizes

the possibility of a change of caste, which can only come about by marriage.[74] If a Brahmin male married a Vaiśya female the progeny formed a separate caste. If a girl of this caste was married to a Brahmin male, and if their daughter again was married in the same way, and if such unions were continued for five or seven generations from the girl of the original mixed stock then the issue would be regarded as Brahmins. Evidently only the progeny through a female could thus be raised to a higher caste. The male issue of such mixed marriages could marry either among themselves or in the caste of their mother. Their progeny in the fifth or the seventh generation, if the males continued to marry in the caste of their mother, was reduced to the caste of the female of the original mixed stock. Suitable marriages, continued through generations, alone could effect a change in caste. That this elaborate rule should have led to any practical results is more than doubtful.

The epics contain some examples of intercaste marriages, but they illustrate the practice prevailing among the aristocracy and the sages. We will leave out the sages as their stories are shrouded in much mystic lore. As for the aristocracy we have already mentioned that Daśaratha had a Śūdra female as one of his wives. But the Rāmāyana does not drop any hint that the children of the union were regarded as in any way different from the Kshatriya. Śantanu married Satyavatī, the daughter of a fisherman. In the story of the Mahābhārata no suggestion is made that the issue would be considered lower than the Kshatriyas. The girl's father extorts a promise from the king that the son of Satyavatī by him shall be the heir to the throne to the exclusion of his other son, not because he feared that the status of the son of his daughter would debar him from his right to the throne, but because the other son of the king, being the eldest, would be entitled to it. As a matter of fact, the Kauravas and the Pāndavas, the heroes of the Mahābhārata, are represented as the descendants of the line of Satyavatī. Though the Kshatriyas were willing to marry females of lower castes and bring up the progeny as their equals, yet they could not toler-

ate their daughters marrying men of faulty descent. Thus Draupadi at her choice-marriage raised an objection against Karṇa on the ground of his low birth.

Apropos of this treatment of the Śūdras the information regarding the various classes of Śūdras furnished by the grammarian Patanjali is very significant. There were recognized at least five varieties of Śūdras. First, there were the Śakas and the Yavanas who resided outside Āryāvarta, the home of the Āryas. Second, there were the Chaṇḍālas and the Doms, who resided within the limits of towns and villages of the Āryas but whose food-vessels could not be used by the latter even after purification. Third, there were groups like the carpenters, the washermen, the blacksmiths and the weavers, whose food-vessels could be used by the Āryas after appropriate cleansing but who could not be permitted to attend sacrificial sessions and rituals. Fourth, by implication there were the Śūdras, the specific illustrative groups being not named by Patanjali who could attend even sacrificial sessions and rituals. Fifth, there were those who lived beyond the limits of Āryan villages and towns.[75]

The third period of Indian history, as I have conceived the periods, is marked by two developments in the ideals of the Hindu Dharma, which had an important bearing on the theory and practice of caste.[76] The glorification of gifts to Brahmins, which became so absorbing a feature of later Hinduism, was largely the contribution of this age. True it is that certain hymns in the Rigveda praise the giving of gifts, and are known as Dāna-Stutis, but they remained outside the main currents of the Upanishadic age, which was seething with philosophical discussions. Nor are they so definitive in their tone as the dictum of Manu that gifts alone—and by gifts Manu unequivocally means gifts to Brahmins—is the supreme duty of man in the Kali age.[77] Another noteworthy development is the schematic growth of imaginary hells as punishments for certain offenders and the progressive application of the doctrine of rebirth. Penances have been always ordained for specific breaches of sacred rules. If these are

not performed by the offenders, then the picture of torments in hell is held before the sinners. The dread of these imaginary hells was a new and perhaps a more effective method of seeing that penances were scrupulously performed. Unhesitating faith in the penances naturally adds to the importance of the Brahmins. The theory of rebirth is sought to be skilfully employed as a sanction for certain rules of conduct. The perpetrator of a particular offence, it is declared, will be born in such and such a low station. The murderer of a Brahmin will be reborn not as man but only as some beast. Those who relinquish without necessity their divinely ordained occupations will become the servants of the Dasyus. A Śūdra who has fallen from his duty becomes an evil spirit feeding on moths.[78] Dread of horrible future births must have helped to uphold the proper practice of at least some of the rules connected with caste. The total result of the pronounced developments of these tendencies in this period is to be seen in the preposterous claims put forward in favour of the Brahmins.

According to Manu the Brahmin is the lord of this whole creation, because he is produced from the purest part of the Supreme Being, namely the mouth. Both the gods and manes have to receive their offerings through them. They are, therefore, the most exalted amongst men, so much so that, by his mere birth as a Brahmin, a person is the living embodiment of the eternal law. The function that fire served in Vedic worship is now discharged by the Brahmin. He replaces, so to say, fire as an intermediary between man and the gods. A Brahmin alone can become one with Brahmin, for only he of all the varṇas is entitled to enter the fourth stage of life, viz. asceticism. Feeding the Brahmins is one of the acknowledged ways of gaining religious merit.[79] Inscriptions of this period testify to the fact that this was not a mere pious wish of the Brahmins, but a living reality acted up to by contemporary men and women.[80] A Brahmin is entitled to whatever exists in the world. In fact, the whole world is his property, and others live on his charity.[81] So sacred are they that not to wait on them is one of the causes

leading to the degradation of the Kshatriyas. In purity they are compared with fire and water, the two pre-eminently purifying agents. Whatever forbidden acts they do in adversity do not, therefore, contaminate them.[82] Vishṇu is more audacious than Manu in asserting the worth of the Brahmins. He is not satisfied with claiming that they are intermediaries between man and the gods, but would like to enthrone them as the equals of gods, nay even as their master. He observes: "The gods are invisible deities, the Brahmins are visible deities. The Brahmins sustain the world. It is by the favour of the Brahmins that the gods reside in the heavens; a speech uttered by Brahmins (whether a curse or a benediction) never fails to come true. What the Brahmins pronounce, when highly pleased, (if they promise sons, cattle, wealth, or some other boon to a man) the gods will ratify; when the visible gods are pleased the invisible gods are surely pleased as well."[83] Even the level-headed administrator Kautilya suggested that in order to avert such providential calamities as fire, flood, and pestilence, the people should worship gods and Brahmins.[84]

Naturally many are the privileges that are claimed for the Brahmins. Kauṭilya exempted him from torture to elicit confession and from corporal punishment except it be for high treason.[85] While in the last period it was only the Śūdra who was enjoined to serve the varṇas and particularly the Brahmin, now all the three varṇas are exhorted to serve the Brahmin, the theory being that each lower caste owes subservience to all the higher castes.[86] Nārada exhorts a king to be constantly showing honour to the Brahmins for "a field furnished with Brahmins is the root of the prosperity of the world." The king must show himself first in the morning to the Brahmins and salute them. To them belongs the right to collect flowers and such other things, to converse with other men's wives without any restraint, and to cross rivers without paying any fare for the ferry. If engaged in trade, they may use the ferry without paying any toll.[87] Yet with all his exaltation a Brahmin is exhorted to follow the rules of conduct laid down for him lest he should miss the fruit of his

Vedic studies. And the old saying, applauding the union of the Brahmin and the Kashatriya, is glibly paraded forth.[88]

The Śūdra gets socially more degraded, though ways and means are discovered for his religious emancipation. In the latter connection, the later division into "sat" and "asat"—good and bad—Śūdras first makes its appearance. And the rules regarding social and moral life, evincing greater degradation of the class, must evidently have been devised for the use of the latter class, viz. the "asat" Śūdras. Servitude is proclaimed to be a permanent condition of a Śūdra, whether he be actually bought or not. A Śūdra must not acquire wealth, because thereby he causes pain to the Brahmins. Manu roundly declares that a Śūdra cannot commit an offence causing loss of his caste, so degraded was he.[89] Where some kinds of spirituous liquors are forbidden to the members of the twice-born castes, the Śūdra is left to himself.[90] Evidently the Śūdra was regarded beyond the pale of moral influence. The Brahmin did not even condescend to expect of him an adherence to his high moral precepts. A householder, when sipping water for personal purification, must not use it if brought by a Śūdra. A member of the first three castes must not travel in the company of Śūdras. It seems that the Śūdras were considered to impart some sort of defilement to objects like bed and seat by their touch.[91] According to Kauṭilya, a Śūdra calling himself a Brahmin shall have his eyes destroyed by poison or shall pay the heavy fine of eight hundred "paṇas". If he violates a Brahmin female he shall be burnt to death. If he intentionally reviles or criminally assaults a Brahmin the offending limb shall be cut.[92]

In the sphere of religion the tendency is to forbid to the Śūdra the use of the most efficacious formulae and rites on the one hand, and to exhort him to perform most of the daily rites and the obligatory sacraments prescribed for the other castes. The doctrine of salvation through the conscientious discharge of the duties proper to caste is, indeed, mentioned here and there. But evidently the Brahmin lawgivers of this period did not feel fully satisfied with that

method of salvation. They had come to possess too much faith in the efficacy of the rites and sacraments to allow them to be neglected even by the Śūdra. The liberalizing influence of the Buddhist revolt and of Vaishnava compassion led the Brahmins to devise ways and means of assuring spiritual betterment to the Śūdra in the Brahmanic way of rites and sacraments. It must also be mentioned that the performance of the Brahmanic rites and sacraments by a large section of the people had a selfish interest for the Brahmin, which he could not have entirely lost sight of. Rites and sacraments require the services of a Brahmin. The Śūdra caste—the largest section of the people—was the only one which was denied sacred knowledge. If the Śūdras wanted to perform the Brahmanic rites and sacraments they would invariably have to requisition the serivces of a Brahmin. To allow the Śūdra the privilege of these sacred performances was thus to ensure a large clientele for the Brahmin. Yet neither the genuine desire to widen the scope of his religious regulations so as to make it possible for the lowly Śūdra to work for his spiritual uplift in the Brahmanic way, nor the selfish motive of procuring mass clientele was strong enough for the Brahmin to override completely his supreme faith in the sanctity of his lore or his high regard for ceremonial purity. He began to make a distinction between the Śūdra who behaved properly according to the Brahmin's ideas, and the Śūdra who was slovenly enough not to come up to this standard of conduct—the "sat" and the "asat" Śūdra. Only the former class of Śūdras was allowed the privilege of the practice of rites and sacraments though without the use of the Vedic formulae.

Yājñavalkya opines that the usual sacraments are accompanied by the recital of mantras only in the case of the first three castes. The Śūdras, by implication, were to perform them without the use of Vedic formulae. They had to use the ordinary formula of "namas" (obeisance). They may offer in the same way the daily sacrifices on the domestic fire and also the annual offering to the manes.[93] According to the Śukranīti, a Śūdra must perform all the sacred duties

incumbent on him with the help of the "namas" formula, which is here explained in the terminology, usual in the next period, as the mantras given in the Purānas.[94] Atri, Laghu-śaṅkha, and Likhita draw a distinction between the Śūdras and the other castes by enjoining the Śūdra to undertake only charitable and welfare works and to eschew the Vedic performances.[95] Manu is more rigorous in his refusal of the right of the Śūdra to fulfil the sacred law of the Āryas. But even he is prepared to make a concession in the case of those Śūdras who are desirous of gaining merit, and exhorts them to imitate the practices of the virtuous.[96] Yājñavalkya also seems to recognize the higher claims of those Śūdras whose conduct is proper according to the Brahmanic ideas.[97] Ushanas, Bṛhadyama, and Laghuvishṇu classify the Śūdras into sat and asat.[98] The most potent agent for personal purification that the Brahmins have thought of, viz. the liquid made up by the mixture of cow's milk, curds, ghee, urine, and dung is, however, considered so sacred a thing that if a Śūdra drinks it, he commits as heinous a sin as a Brahmin who drinks spirituous liquor.[99]

The approximation of the Vaiśya to the Śūdra, already noticed in the last period, is carried further in this. In the account of the creation of the four castes from the body of the Supreme Being, Manu groups the two castes together as being produced out of that half of the body, which is less sanctified than the other half, above the navel, from which the Brahmin and the Kshatriya are represented to have emerged.[100] While dealing with the question as to who should be treated as his guest by a Brahmin, Manu and Vishṇu recommend that a Vaiśya and a Śūdra guest may be allowed to eat with one's servants, out of compassion.[101] Yājñavalkya prescribes for the Vaiśya the same period of death-impurity as the one he recommends for a good Śūdra.[102] We have seen that a Brahmin could not generally accept food offered by a Śūdra, though he could eat what was given to him by a Vaiśya. Some writers of this period extend this privilege to the good Śūdras, thus putting them on a par with the Vaiśyas.[103] According to Kauṭilya the issue of a Vaiśya

by a Śūdra wife is a Śūdra.[104]

Of the castes that are supposed to spring from mixed marriages the offspring of hypergamous unions among the first three castes are allowed by Manu the rites and duties of the twice-born. The other mixed castes, according to him, are entitled only to the religious privileges of the Śūdras.[105] Yājñavalkya's view is clearly stated only in the case of the Chaṇḍāla, whom he describes as outside the pale of the sacred law.[106] Śukranīti strikes a different note, more in consonance with the religious feelings of the later period, when worship through muttering the name of god came to be believed to be the universal and easy method of spiritual uplift. The issue of the mixed marriages of a hypergamous nature, excepting perhaps the offspring of a Brahmin male and a Kshatriya female, are to be treated as Śūdras. This view is in marked contrast with that of the Dharma literature, but in perfect conformity with that of the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, who lays down that such mixed castes shall take to the occupations and practise the religious rites of the Śūdras. Progeny of unions in the inverse order of castes is assigned to a new category, to be met with in the caste-organization of the later period. They are the lowest of the Śūdras and must practise their duties for their religious uplift by repeating only the name of god.[107] Thus the pratilomas (offspring of unions of females of higher and males of lower castes) are no doubt outside the pale of the Brahmanic law, as they were in the last period; but the general tendency of liberalizing religious regulations, as we observed has effected a change in the attitude towards the necessity of spiritual betterment for these groups. And the newer method of religious worship is thrown open to them.

The solidarity of a caste as a unit of social organization is more and more acknowledged. It is the duty of the king to see that the various castes observe their own rules and regulations, and to bring back the erring members to their path of duty. He has also to differentiate between different castes by appropriate marks of distinction.[108] The

king must inquire into the laws of castes before settling disputes. When enacting any law he must see that the proposed law is not at variance with the customs of castes.[109] Jāti or caste had come to be a very important feature of social organization. Both the plaintiff and the defendant in a lawsuit had to register their jāti. Defamation of one's nation or village was punishable with lower amercement than the one for the defamation of one's caste or guild. Kauṭilya prescribes differential rate of interest for debts according to caste, a Brahmin being charged 2 per cent, a Kshatriya 3, a Vaiśya 4 and a Śūdra 5 per cent. He lays down the use of four separate formulae for addressing witnesses of the four castes and for swearing them in.[110] Nārada recognizes the right of a member of a caste to succeed to the property of the deceased in case he has no near heirs entitled to succession.[111] Yājñayalkya requires a suitor to mention his caste in his plaint.[112] And that was quite natural in a society where a writer on administration laid down that among persons who might be suspected to be murderers, etc., were those who misstated their caste and "gotra". Generally persons of low caste and avocation were to be suspected of such serious crimes.[113] The solidarity of the Brahmin caste is very pronounced. Members of the caste owe certain duties to fellow-members on certain occasions. One of them is that of inviting certain neighbours of the caste to a dinner-party, at which twenty Brahmins are entertained.[114] It appears that specific quarters of towns and cities were occupied by certain castes and occupational groups. Thus Chārudatta, the Brahmin merchant, was living in the quarter of the Śreshṭhis or merchant princes. Bāṇa, the author of Harashacharita had his residence in the Brahmin-quarters (Brāhmaṇādhivāsa').

What constitutes effective association between members of a group is important from the point of view of the development of caste. Vishṇu's views on association, though they govern the outcasts and the "mlecchas", are very much like the ideas that regulated social intercourse between caste and caste or between the members of a single caste in later times. Sitting on the same bench, riding in the same carriage, lying

on the same couch, or eating in the company of a person proves such close relations that if a person happens to be an outcast, the person associating with him in the ways indicated above, becomes himself an outcast after a year. One who habitually drinks water from or bathes in a pool situated in a foreign country reduces himself to the status of the inhabitant of that country.[115] We can clearly recognize in these ideas, once they were applied to social behaviour, the potency to create, in course of time, newer and newer castes.

Food offered by a Śūdra is generally forbidden to a Brahmin as in the last period, but with this difference that, in addition to the specifically privileged Śūdras, there is the class of the good Śūdras whose food may be accepted. The general tenor of the detailed regulations leads me to believe that this permitted food was to be either uncooked or specially prepared in milk or ghee. According to Vishṇu, a member of the first three castes has to undergo a penance if he takes food offered by a carpenter, a blacksmith, a goldsmith, a dealer in molasses and other liquids, an oil-presser, a weaver, a dyer of cloths, a cane-worker, or a washerman. The later distinction between food prepared without the addition of water and that in which water is used is mentioned by Atri. He allows a Brahmin to accept from a Śūdra anything that is prepared in ghee and articles like milk, buttermilk, curds, etc. Consistently with this distinction in food the same writer forbids a Brahmin to take water from a Śūdra. The food offered even by a Kshatriya or a Vaiśya was not considered to be perfectly innocuous.[116]

The origin of the later practice for members of different castes not to sit in the same row for taking meals must be discovered in an idea expressed by Aṅgiras. He opines that if, among persons taking their meals sitting in a row, one of them happens to have committed any sin, all the others share it. This possibility of guilt can, however, be evaded by the interposition of doors, posts, ashes, and water.[117]

We have already noticed that Vishnu enjoins the house-

holders of the first three castes not to travel in the company of the Śūdras. The reason for this injunction was that probably the Śūdra was considered to impart pollution by contact. As a matter of fact, according to the interpretation put by the commentator on another rule, the Śūdra's touch defiled objects like vehicles and seats and thus rendered them unfit for use unless water was sprinkled over them.[118] Aṅgiras requires a Brahmin to sip water for purification if he comes in contact with a washerman, a leather-worker, a fisherman, or a cane-worker. Manu declares the Chaṇḍālas and others like them to be worthy of being settled outside the town-limits They were to be treated as 'apapātras', i.e. the vessels used by them were not to be used by other castes.[119] This disability we know to be very old. And Manu's exhortation to keep them on the outskirts marks a further deterioration in their position. Kauṭilya upholds Manu's position by prescribing that the Chaṇḍālas shall live beyond the burial grounds. A simile used by him makes it quite clear that the Chaṇḍālas had their own reservoirs of water which the other classes would not use.[120] A Brahmin, drinking water from the vessel of a Chaṇḍāla, has to undergo the penance of living on cow's urine for a number of days. Nay, Laghuśaṅkha goes even further and prescribes this penance if a Brahmin happens to drink water from a well from which Chaṇḍāla has drawn water. Samvarta's opinion is still more stringent inasmuch as he regards even running water as defiled, if it is used by the Antyajas or outcasts. From Bāna's argument it becomes clear that this was an extreme view. He is definite that fruits offered by a Chaṇḍāla could be accepted by others. Even water from the vessel of a Chaṇḍāla could be used provided it was first poured out of it on the ground.[121] Much more therefore must running water have been proof against pollution by a Chaṇḍāla. Atri declares a washerman, a leather-worker, a cane-worker, a fisherman, and a Bhil to be Antyajas or outcastes. Vedavyāsa adds to this list several other castes. According to Uśanas, the Chaṇḍāla was to enter a village for sweeping, etc., in the first half of the day, carrying a broom under his armpit and a small pot hanging at his neck.[122] These regulations remind one of Poona life in the days of the

Peshwas, and establish the early existence of unapproachability.

The later theory of pollution by contact and its limits finds its first mention in Vṛddhahārita who observes that the effect of contact is limited to three persons, the fourth person if touched being free. A regulation of Atri about touch-pollution fully breathes the later spirit. In sacrificial sessions, in religious and marriage processions, and on all festive occasions there is no question of untouchability.[123] Hemachandra has listed the words 'khikkhirī' and 'jhañjharī', as non-Sanskritic, meaning a stick carried in their hands by such untouchables as Chaṇḍālas and Dumbas in order to warn people of their approach.[124]

The traditional scheme of occupations of the four castes is laid down as usual, but with some modifications, quite in keeping with the changed attitude towards the status of some of these groups. Thus, Yājñavalkya allows a Śūdra, in case of necessity, to engage in trade, which was erstwhile regarded as the sole preserve of the Vaiśyas.[125] Agriculture, again, in the opinion of some, was a proper occupation for the Śūdra. Further, it was more and more regarded as a suitable occupation for all castes.[126] Nevertheless, Manu, as usual, represents the more orthodox view. Remarking that some regard agriculture as an excellent occupation, he contends that it is blameworthy because the plough injures the earth and the living organisms.[127] There are indications that the ideal occupations prescribed for the four castes were not necessarily followed by them. The Brahmins particularly seemed to have taken to many of the occupations that were entirely forbidden to them or allowed only in straightened circumstances. This is the only legitimate inference we can draw from the long lists of unholy Brahmins who must not be invited to a Śrāddha dinner.[128] Chārudatta, a Brahmin by birth, is represented in the play *Mṛcchakaṭika* as following the occupation of a Vaiśya. It has descended to him from his father's father. In spite of this occupation his Brahmanic conception about ceremonial purity required him to give

directions to his friend that the ornaments deposited by the courtezan Vasantasenā should not be taken into the inner quadrangle of the house for fear of polluting the sacrosanct precincts of Brahmin females.[129] That the occupation of the Kshatriya was often usurped by other castes is abundantly clear from the accounts of some of the ruling houses of this period. Harshavardhana of Kanauj, by contemporary account, was a Vaiśya,[130] while the Kadamba rulers of Banawasi were Brahmins.[131] A Sanskrit inscription of the middle of the 5th century A.D. discovered at Mandasor in the Gwalior territories of Malwa records how some families of silk-weavers migrating there from Central Gujarat adopted different occupations as chance offered itself, varying from that of an archer and a warrior to that of an astrologer, an exponent of religious doctrines and an ascetic. Another from Indapur (Indore) registers the taking up of the conventional profession of a Vaiśya by Kshatriyas.[132]

We have seen above the reason advanced by Manu why agriculture should be regarded as an unworthy occupation for the Brahmin. In regard to other occupations we do not know the grounds on which the status of an occupation was determined. Yet there is no doubt that there was some defined scheme of status of different occupations which depended not so much on their lucrativeness as on their ceremonial purity. Nārada distinguishes all work as either pure or impure, and mentions the following as impure work: sweeping the gateway, the privy, and the road, rubbing the master's limbs, shampooing the secret parts, and gathering and putting away the leavings of food, ordure, and urine.[133]

There is still permission for the three castes to marry outside their 'varṇa' excepting from among the Śūdras. But a wife of lower 'varṇa' is declared to be unfit for the performance of religious rites.

The number of new groups, formed by unions between the members of the four castes, and by further intermarriages between these groups and so on, is no longer the limited

number that it was in the last period.[134] With all this multiplicity, however, to each group is ascribed some more or less definite occupation. It appears that in reality new occupational groups having the characteristics of castes had arisen, and the Brahmanic account of their origins was a mere theory based on permutations and combinations of the four original castes which bounded the Brahmins' mental horizon.

That intercaste marriages were not absolutely out of vogue even to the end of the period under review is proved by epigraphical and other data. But it seems that except in the case of a Brahmin marrying a Śūdra female the issue of such marriages were not singled out for special treatment, proper for a class different from that of the father or the mother. The Imperial Guptas who were Vaiśyas had given one of their princesses in marriage to a Vākāṭaka prince of the Brahmin dynasty of the Deccan. It is recorded by a Chinese traveller that the daughter of King Harsha, who was a Vaiśya, was married to a Kshatriya, and it does not appear that the children of the union were regarded as anything else than Kshatriyas.[135] A Jodhpur inscription of the latter half of the ninth century mentions the case of a Brahmin, who had two wives, one of whom was a Kshatriya lady. The children of this lady were classed as Kshatriyas.[136] In the tenth century, Rājaśekhara, a Brahmin, took a Chāhamāna lady to wife.[137] An inscription from Bengal, ascribed to the seventh century, describes a certain individual as "pāraśava" and makes him the issue of a Brahmin father and a Śūdra mother, which is in conformity with rules of the sacred laws.[138] Bāṇa in his Harshacharita, also tells us that his father, a Brahmin, had a Śūdra wife besides a Brahmin one, and describes her issue as his "pāraśava brothers".

The state of caste-organization as revealed by literature and the inscriptions of the fourth period is strikingly similar to that which we noticed as prevailing about the middle of the nineteenth century. The leading authorities of this period are Parāśara, Hemādri, Mādhava, and Kamalākara. The traditional account of the total extermination of the Kshatriyas

by Paraśurāma, strengthened by their defection to Buddhism, had already given rise to the theory that the Kshatriya race had ceased to exist with the Nandas. The rout of the older Kshatriya families, caused by the inroads of the Hūṇas, further lent support to the theory. Finally the rude shock that was given to Hindu sovereignty by the early Muslim conquerors so far convinced the Pandits of the extinction of the Kshatriyas that we find Kamalākara only grudgingly acknowledging their existence as a rare phenomenon.[139] This shadowy existence of the Kshatriyas rendered it unnecessary for the Brahmins, even if they wished it, to curtail their privileges excepting in very few particulars which touched the interests of the Brahmin caste. We, therefore, find the old scheme of four castes mentioned *in toto* in the literature of this period. Yet hypergamy is forbidden in favour of endogamy by Hemādri.[140] The use of spirituous drinks is sinful only for the Brahmin and not for the Kshatriya and the Vaiśya as formerly. A Brahmin may take the food prepared either by a Kshatriya or a Vaiśya in their own houses only on certain religious occasions, provided these persons have lived according to the sacred law.[141]

We have already noticed the progressive assimilation of the Vaiśya with the Śūdra, and we find Kamalākara, the latest authority of this period, openly declaring that the Vaiśyas are hardly known to exist in the Kali age. In the regulations of this period it is becoming more and more clear that writers on religion treat both the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras as almost indistinguishable. The occupations prescribed by Parāśara, who is par excellence the mentor of the age, for both of them are the same, viz., agriculture, trade and crafts, with the usual addition of service of the Brahmins in the case of the Śūdras.[142] Vaiśya's food is almost as much taboo to the Brahmin as that of the Śūdra.[143]

In the treatment of the Śūdras, it seems that the distinction made in the last period between 'sat' and 'asat' Śūdra was acted upon locally in Northern India, and did not appeal to writers on sacred law, hailing from Southern India. To

them a Śūdra was a Śūdra, and as such untouchable, except in name. Mādhava exhorts a Brahmin to avoid living in the same house with a Śūdra or accompanying him in a carriage. Nor must he take food ordinarily cooked by him. But food that is prepared in oily substance or in milk may be accepted, provided it is eaten not in the house of the Śūdra but on the banks of a river.[144] Hemādri even goes further and impresses upon a Brahmin the sinfulness of eating one's food in a Śūdra's house though prepared by oneself with the raw materials supplied by the Śūdra.[145] Even the food of the few privileged Śūdras that was formerly acceptable to the Brahmin is ruled out by Mādhava as a custom unsuited for the Kali age.[146] So determined has the opposition to the Śūdra's food become, that Kamalākara is at pains to explain away ancient texts by all manner of fanciful interpretations.[147]

In the field of religion the Śūdra has not only retained the rights that were conceded to him but finds them now ever more well-defined and codified beyond all cavil by Kamalākara, who even upholds his right to the use of the all-purifying mixture, "pañchagavya."[148] As already observed, this religious emancipation of the Śūdra does not by any means put him on an equal footing with the higher castes. Even within the folds of new creeds like devotional Vaishṇavism, where, perfect religious equality may, naturally, be expected the Śūdra's inferiority is taken for granted and even acted upon. It is precisely because Rāmānanda, one of the apostolic successors of Rāmānuja, the founder of perhaps the most catholic form of Vaishṇavism, was insulted by his brethren for his social inferiority that he travelled northwards and established a new sect. He asked his followers not to inquire about anyone's caste.[149]

The religious upheaval in Mahārāshṭra which began about the beginning of the thirteenth century, produced considerable appreciation in the religious position of the Śūdra. We have already seen that the Śūdra was exhorted to mutter the descriptive names of God for his salvation. This method of spiritual betterment was gradually be-

coming an integral part of the developing creeds of Śaivism and Vaishṇavism. About the beginning of this period or a little earlier, Nāmamāhātmya or the importance of muttering the names of God was freely acknowledged in the Brahmanic works. In the period under review, there flourished in Mahārāshṭra a number of Śūdra saints of outstanding personality. They explored and perfected this easy method of salvation for the Śūdras. The special method of preaching by means of peripatetic sermons delivered in temples with the accompaniment of some simple music was carried to perfection by two non-Brahmin saints, Nāmdev and Tukārām. The traditional history written by Mahipati in the middle of the eighteenth century makes this quite clear. Further, of the saints who contributed to the new religious forces a large majority was formed by the non-Brahmins. Of the Brahmin saints, many cannot be regarded as being wholly in a direct line of this movement. They still laid much emphasis on the philosophic aspect of religion. Jñāneśwar with his brother and sister and Ekanāth seem to be the outstanding Brahmin saints who had the greatest sympathy with the new doctrine of salvation through the muttering of the names of God. The former were the children of a Brahmin ascetic, returned to the living of a householder and as such much despised by the Brahmins. Ekanāth ventured to feed the untouchables at a Śrāddha-dinner (dinner in honour of the manes) before the invited Brahmins had had their meals. For this sacrilegious act, even though God had performed a miracle in favour of Ekanāth, the local Brahmins insisted on his undergoing a purificatory rite which Ekanāth duly performed. This intrepid Brahmin even dared to dine at a Mahār's house. Almost everywhere the Brahmins figured as opponents of the new movements which appeared to them to upset the good old Brahmanic way of salvation through proper rites and ceremonies and to undermine the system of caste.[150] By their poetic ability, their capacity for religious experience, and by their pure life, these Śūdras impressed their contemporaries—irrespective of caste—so much so that they were enthroned as saints and adored by all. These saints of Mahārāshtra produced a revolution without the uproar of a re-

bellion. The Śūdra, who was accustomed to look upon it as a great privilege to be allowed to practise the Brahmanic rites, though only with the accompaniment of the Puranic mantras, now produced individuals who struck out a new path and established themselves as teachers. And the Brahmin, who was doubtful whether a Śūdra was even capable of profiting by his religious teachings, had to accept some of these Śūdras as his religious masters. Devotional schools of religious sects produced a more or less similar change in the other parts of India.

These Śūdra saints, though they exploited the easy method of salvation and thus freed the Śūdras from the Brahmanic domination in their spiritual life, upheld the old order of the four castes including their own status of inferiority in the scheme. There was another contemporary movement which proclaimed a wholesale revolt against caste. It was the sect of the Mānbhāvas.[151] It proved to be an unsuccessful attempt, giving rise to a new caste. The followers of this sect were contemptuously treated and even bitterly hated by all classes of the population.

In Bengal Ramāi opened up the initiation ceremony for the 'thirtysix castes' which like the Dom were denied initiation. When the Sahajiya sect grew into importance in the 17th and 18th centuries its followers declared themselves against caste system and declined to accept the superior position of the Brahmins. If the Sahajiya sect was rather a revolt, Vaishṇavism could not be looked upon as such. Yet its attitude to caste was not far different. Srinivāsa, a Brahmin, Rāmachandra, a Vaiśya, and Narotam, a Kayastha were all Vaishnavas and as such were not afraid to take their meals from the same plate.[152]

In the treatment of the outcaste section of the society this period witnesses a development which is in keeping with the ideas of ceremonial purity. Untouchability is graded according to the supposed impurity of the object. A Brahmin should keep a distance of one 'yuga', two, three and four yugas be-

tween himself and a degraded person, a woman in her period, a parturient woman, and a Chaṇḍāla respectively in order that he may not catch pollution from them.[153]

In the sphere of religion the lot of these people is sought to be improved for the first time in the history of Hinduism. It was Rāmānuja, the Brahmin, who took bold steps for the religious betterment of these people. He secured for them the privilege of visiting the temple one day in the year and devised something which they might put on corresponding to the sacred thread of the Brahmins.[154]

In Mahārāshṭra and other parts of India also the untouchables produced some saints who were not only adored by their own caste but in course of time came to be highly respected by all.

The traditional assignment of occupations to the four castes is very largely modified. We have already noticed that the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras are given common occupations, viz. trade, agriculture, and crafts. The Brahmin is allowed to live on agriculture provided he employs Śūdra labourers to do the actual work. Mādhava candidly observes that it is not possible in the Kali age for the Brahmin to maintain himself on sacrificial fees. The economic aspect seems to have affected the writer to such an extent that he allows all the four varṇas to trade and to practise crafts.[155] The ancient profession of the Kshatriyas we find taken up by other castes as well. It is well known that the Peshwa rulers of Poona were Brahmins. The Chera, Chola, and Pandya kings belonged to the caste of the Vellalas,[156] a cultivating caste of Madras. The Nāyak kings of Madura and Tanjore were Balijas, traders by caste.[157] In some parts even the so-called aborigines ruled over petty principalities. The Gonds provide perhaps the best example.[158] The occupational diversity was far greater than the one contemplated in the old scheme and is frankly recognized both by Mādhava and Kamalākara in their treatment of mixed marriages.

As regards the regulations of marriage, the four castes

and the other groups are regarded as completely endogamous units, hypergamy being positively discouraged. The list of groups considered to have been the result of mixed unions becomes very large and includes almost all the groups, occupational or otherwise, known to the authors, as behaving like unit castes. Kamalākara's list, for example, includes such groups as Kolhati or Bahurupi, Kandu, Sali, Mochi, Burud, Ghasi, and others.[159] Mādhava tries to explain the origins only of about sixty groups and characteristically observes, "Innumerable are the caste-like groups that are produced by miscegenation."[160] It is clear that whatever element of reality this theory of the origins of the numerous caste-like groups, besides the four ancient castes, possessed at the outset, by now it was merely a hypothetical explanation of the increasing caste-groups in the society. The Brahmin writers could not rid themselves of the idea of the four original castes. To them numerous further groups could have been only produced as a result of unions between the members of the four-castes, just as these latter were created from the body of the Supreme Being. In fact, this is the Brahmanical theory of the origins of the numerous castes. Mādhava makes a frank and rare admission that the practices and regulations about the four castes have been changing from age to age.[161]

Caste as a group comprised within a larger class and with no necessary connection with occupation, is contemplated by the commentators and Nibandha-writers of this period. According to them, out of the many tribunals designed for justice one consisted of persons living in the same place following different occupations, and belonging to different castes, while another consisted of people carrying on one type of occupation but belonging to different castes.[162] Nīḷakaṇṭha explains a regulation of Yājñavalkya about witnesses to mean that they shall be according to the castes and 'varṇa' of the litigants. If the castes of the parties differ, then witnesses belonging to the 'varṇa' in which the castes are comprised should be called in.[163]

Thus by the end of this period we visualize the caste-

organization, as revealed in the literature of the period, to be not at all different in any essential point form the one which I described as prevailing in the middle of the nineteenth century. Perhaps it may be contended that there is not the same multiplicity of groups described in this literature. I have opined that the theory of mixed castes, as expanded by the contemporary writers, marks the numerous groups that had come into existence. Now I propose to present some data from literary records, inscriptions and travellers' accounts bearing on the names and the variety of contemporary groups which corroborate my view.

Hemachandra mentions the Nāgara Brahmins under the appellation Nāgareyaka.[164]

In a Prakrit inscription of an early date of the Brahmanic kings Śivaskandavarman of Kanchi are mentioned "Vallave" (herdsman) and "Govallave" (cow-herdsman).[165] In an inscription of the tenth century from Lalitpur district, occur the following names of professions or castes in combination with the proper names of individuals: "Vaṇika" (merchant), "Nemakavaṇika" (salt-merchant), "Tāmbūlika" (betel-seller) and "Sūtradhāra" (carpenter). In the same place is mentioned the shop of a brazier (Kamsara) and that of a Brahmin betel-seller.[166] In a South Indian inscription the boundaries of a particular piece of land are fixed in reference to the lands of a blacksmith (Karumān),[167] "Vellālan" (cultivator) So-and-so or of such and such locality.[168] Ilavas (toddy-tappers) are referred to in another inscription.[169] In the ancient city of Conjeevaram certain quarters were mostly inhabited by weavers, "who were patronized by the king and consisted of two sections of Pattasalins," which correspond with the identical divisions of the present day Saliyans (weavers) of Madras.[170] Venkayya has observed that many names of individuals occurring in some of the South Indian inscriptions have as their second portions names of "profession or caste to which the individual belonged, with a complimentary epithet, the whole title meaning 'the great dancing master . . . carpenter, goldsmith, brazier, Brahmana,

etc., of the king whose name is prefixed to the title."[171]

A "Gauḍakaraṇika" (writer from the Gauḍa country) is mentioned in a North Indian inscription of the end of the tenth century.[172] In an inscription from Dharwar District belonging to the eleventh century occurs a clear reference to the division of the non-Brahmin castes of Madras into those of the right hand and those of the left.[173] Another reference to this well-known but not properly understood distinction occurs in a Madras inscription of about the same time.[174] Another inscription mentions some persons who refer to themselves as Śiva-Brāhmaṇas.[175] Kaṇmālar (artisans of Madras) are allowed certain rights, which were evidently not enjoyed by them previously. They may blow double conches and drums at their marriages and funerals; they may wear sandals, and cover their houses with plaster.[176] In an inscription from Chingleput District, ascribed to the middle of the twelfth century, a witness to a document refers to himself as "I, the carpenter So-and-so, who possesses the better half of the land of the carpenters in the village".[177] Nāgar Brahmins are mentioned in an inscription from Gujarat belonging to the middle of the twelfth century. An inscription from Orissa, ascribed to the end of the twelfth century mentions a class of Radhiya Brahmins.[178] Maga or Sakadvipiya Brahmins were known as such about the same time.[179] Jaina inscriptions from Mount Abu of the first and second quarters of the thirteenth century mention the following castes: Pragvata, Dharkatta, Shrimala, Oswala, Modha, and also Guguli Brahmins, who are found at present chiefly at Dwarka.[180] Two Maudgala Brahmins are mentioned in one inscription of A.D. 1240 as ministers of one of the Yādava kings. They also served their master in a military capacity.[181] A family of Kayastha race, whose occupation is that of writing, is referred to in a North Indian inscription belonging to the end of the thirteenth century. Some members of this family distinguished themselves as warriors, while one was the governor of a fort.[182] A "Mochi" (shoemaker) founded a temple of Vishṇu at Raipur in the Central Provinces in about A.D. 1415.[183] In a Sanskrit inscription at

Chitorgarh belonging to about A.D. 1429, the composer of the eulogy described himself as the son of one Vishṇu Bhaṭṭ of the Daśapura caste.[184]

Duarte Barbosa speaks of eighteen castes in Malabar, each with customs and idol-worship of its own. The Brahmins serve the kings in almost any respectable capacity but in arms. Some of them even act as courtiers. Though the main occupation of the Tiyans is that of tapping toddy yet many of them are found as quarrymen, as soldiers, and even as agrestic serfs.[185] Domingos Paes tells us that there were many Brahmins in the service of the King of Vijayanagar as officers of the towns and cities, while others lived by trade or cultivation.[186] Abul Fazal remarks that the Vaiśya and the Śūdra are divided into numerous branches. He actually mentions the following castes: Kayasth, Bhar, Bachgoti, Chandel, Chauhan, Gaharwal, Gautami, Ghelot, Kausik, and Raghubansi evidently as sub-divisions among the Rajputs, Ahir, Lodh, Gujar, Kurmi, Bagri, Mina, Meo, Mehtar, Bhil, Koli, Gwalia, Garasiah, Khasia, Baoriya, Bisen, Bais, Khand, and Khari, a division of the Gaud Kayasths.[187] Moreland rightly summarizes the position of caste at the end of Akbar's reign in the following words: "Among the Hindus the caste system existed substantially as it exists today and the differences among castes and races were such that we find travellers speaking of Baniyas or of Gujaratis as 'nations' distinct from Brahmans or Rajputs."[188] In the time of Jehangir, the Baniyas of Gujarat had numerous sub-divisions neither of which would eat nor drink with others.[189] Hamilton, in the middle of the eighteenth century, mentions sixty-five divisions of the Baniyas of Surat.[190]

The impact of Islam was too strong to work as a leaven in the Hindu community. The culture and religious practices of its followers were so different that, as noted by al-Biruni, the Hindus and the Muslims looked upon each other as contraries and natural enemies. Yet the doctrinal liberalization in the matter of contact and food which we noticed in some movements and even the doings in this line of some of the outstanding personalities of their time must be credited to

the influence of Islamic doctrine and practices. The two cultures were too separate to settle down to a greater rapproachment in times, when a death-struggle was being fought by the valiant sons of Ind for self-preservation of a cultural entity.

1. Gautama, p. 234; also compare *Arthaśāstra*, (2), p. 203.
2. *Vyākaraṇamahābhāshya*, I, 2, 72.
3. Vasishṭha, p. 25.
4. JAOS, vol. xiii, p. 95.
5. Baudhāyana, pp. 217-18.
6. Cf. Āpastamba, p. 5.
7. Gautama, p. 238.
8. *Mahābhārata, Śānti Parva*, 34, 32-3.
9. Baudhāyana, p. 150.
10. Baudhāyana, p. 151; Vasishṭha, pp. 56-8.
11. Baudhāyana, p. 167.
12. Vasishṭha, p. 29; Gautama, p. 246.
13. Gautama, p. 250; *Arthaśāstra*, (1), p. 56.
14. Gautama, pp. 204-5.
15. Vasishṭha, p. 92.
16. Baudhāyana, p. 204; Gautama, p. 243.
17. Vasishṭha, p. 82.
18. Gautama, p. 237.
19. Baudhāyana, p. 232; Āpastamba, p. 165.
20. Vasishṭha, pp. 109-10; cf. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), p. 285.
21. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), p. 285.
22. Baudhāyana, pp. 201-2; Āpastamba, pp. 18-9; cf. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), p. 270.
23. Fick, p. 119.
24. Āpastamba, p. 103.
25. Ibid., pp. 66-7.
26. p. 159.
27. Vasishṭha, p. 38.
28. Ibid., p. 69.
29. Gautama, p. 262.
30. Ibid., p. 263.
31. Āpastamba, p. 67.
32. Gautama, p. 264.
33. Vasishṭha, p. 19.
34. Āpastamba. p. 61.
35. p. 280.
36. Gautama, p. 250; Baudhāyana, p. 171.
37. Baudhāyana, p. 235.
38. Vasishṭha, p. 50.
39. *Vyākaraṇamahābhāshya*, II, 4, 10; Āpastamba, I, 7, 21; I, 5, 16;

II, 7, 17; Vasishṭha, XX, 16; Baudhāyana, I, 21, 15; II, 2, 13. N.B. R. G. Bhandarkar first drew attention to the important passage in Patanjali's *Mahābhāshya* in his *Social History of India* in 1901. He commented on it thus: "Patanjali mentions carpenters and blacksmiths as belonging to the Śūdra class. The lowest of them, the Caṇḍālas were in the same degraded condition as they are now" (Collected Works, vol. II, p. 450). P. V. Kane in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. II—pt. I (1941) observes: "Therefore it follows that Pāṇini and Patanjali included 'caṇḍālas, and 'mṛtapas' among Śūdras" (p. 168).

40. p. 103.
41. Baudhāyana, p. 220; Vasishṭha, p. 5.
42. p. 244.
43. Fick, pp. 39, 43.
44. Ibid., pp. 318, 323.
45. Vasishṭha, p. 11; Gautama, pp. 224-30; Āpasamba, pp. 122-3.
46. Vasishṭha, p. 12; Gautama, pp. 209, 211; Baudhāyana, pp. 225-4.
47. p. 225.
48. Āpastamba, p. 144; Gautama, p. 255.
49. Vasishṭha, pp. 12-13; Baudhāyana, p. 236.
50. Gautama, p. 228.
51. Ibid., p. 263.
52. Ibid., p. 437.
53. Ibid., p. 221.
54. Fick, pp. 180-1, 255, 276, 278.
55. Ibid., p. 280.
56. Ibid., pp. 327-30.
57. Ibid., pp. 241, 246.
58. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), pp. 58-9.
59. Fick, pp. 276, 278-9.
60. Ibid., p. 302.
61. Vasishṭha, p. 42; Gautama, pp. 194, 197.
62. p. 178.
63. Baudhāyana, p. 225.
64. Gautama, pp. 195-6; Baudhāyana, pp. 197-8; cf. *Arthaśāstra*, (1) p. 164.
65. C. V. Vaidya, *Epic India*, p. 59.
66. Vasishṭha, pp. 5-6.
67. Ibid., pp. 95-6.
68. Gautama, pp. 197, 306.
69. Ibid., p. 197.
70. Baudhāyana, pp. 197-8; Vasishṭha, pp. 195-6; cf. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), pp. 202-3.
71. Vasishṭha, p. 94.
72. cf. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), p. 203.
73. Fick, pp. 51-3.

74. pp. 196-7.
75. *Vyākaraṇamahābhāshya*, II, 4, 10, N.B. P. V. Kane in his *History of Dharmaśāstra* (vol. II, pt. I, p. 121), observes on this passage: "Śūdras were divided into numerous sub-castes. But there were two main divisions. One was 'aniravasita śūdras' (such as carpenters and blacksmiths) and the other 'niravasita śūdras' (like caṇḍālas)".
76. Data which are common to the last period and the two succeeding ones are not repeated. Only such details as shed light on the development of the institution are collated.
77. Manu, i, 86.
78. Manu, xii, 54-80; also cf. Yājñavalkya, pp. 1243-58.
79. Collection of Smritis, p, 423.
80. R. G. Bhandarkar, *A Peep into the Early History of India*, p. 53.
81. Manu, i, 93-101.
82. Manu, x, 43, 103.
83. Vishṇu. p. 77.
84. *Arthaśāstra* (2), p. 419.
85. Ibid., pp. 270, 277.
86. *Collection of Smritis*, p. 122.
87. Nārada, pp. 218-19.
88. Manu, ix, 322.
89. Manu, viii, 413-14; x, 126.
90. Vishṇu, pp. 95-6.
91. Vishṇu, pp. 99, 198-9.
92. *Arthaśāstra*, (2), pp. 238, 275-6, 285.
93. Yājñavalkya, pp. 11, 86.
94. *Śukranīti*, p. 163.
95. *Collection of Smritis*, pp. 11, 124, 182.
96. Manu, x, 126, 128.
97. Yajñavalkya, p. 1165.
98. *Collection of Smritis*, pp. 48, 101, 122.
99. Vishṇu, p. 15; *Collection of Smritis*, p. 23.
100. Manu, i, 92.
101. Manu, iii, 112; Vishṇu, p. 216.
102. Yājñavalkya, p. 1165.
103. *Collection of Smritis*, p. 122.
104. *Arthaśāstra*, (1), p. 164.
105. Manu, x, 41.
106. Yājñavalkya, p. 67.
107. *Śukranīti*, p. 164; op. cit. (1), p. 165.
108. Yājñavalkya, p. 218; Nārada, p. 215; *Śukranīti*, p. 164.
109. Manu, viii, 41, 46; *Śukranīti*, p. 187.
110. *Arthaśāstra*, (1), p. 176; (2), pp. 236-7.
111. Nārada, p. 201.
112. Yājñavalkya, p. 247.

113. *Arthaśāstra,* (2), pp. 105, 183, 260-1, 267.
114. Manu, viii, 392.
115. Vishṇu, pp. 133, 255.
116. Vishṇu, pp. 163, 164; *Collection of Smritis,* pp. 3, 4, 16, 20, 122, 392.
117. *Collection of Smritis,* p. 5.
118. Vishṇu, p. 99.
119. Op. cit. X, 51.
120. *Arthaśāstra,* (2), pp. 27, 59.
121. *Kādambari* (N.S.P.Ed.), p. 595.
122. *Collection of Smritis,* pp. 1, 16, 18, 22, 46, 125-6, 357, 421.
123. *Collection of Smritis,* pp. 20, 314.
124. Vide *Deśīnāmamālā.*
125. Yājñavalkya, p. 85.
126. *Collection of Smritis,* pp. 173, 273; *Śukranīti,* p. 151.
127. Manu, x, 84.
128. Manu, iii, 150-66.
129. *The Little Clay Cart,* translated by A. W. Ryder (1905), pp. 138. 151.
130. Vaidya, vol. i, pp. 61-2.
131. V. A. Smith, *The Oxford History of India,* 1923, p. 199.
132. Sarkar, D. C., pp. 292, 311.
133. Nārada, pp. 131-2.
134. Manu, x, 8-40; *Collection of Smritis,* pp. 46-8.
135. Vaidya, vol. I. pp. 61-2.
136. Quoted in R. C. Majumdar's *Corporate Life in Ancient India,* (1922), pp. 372-3.
137. Vaidya, vol. ii, p. 180.
138. *Epigraphia Indica,* vol. xv, pp. 305, 310-11.
139. *Śūdra-Kamalākara,* p. 299.
140. Hemādri, vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 667.
141. Parāśara, vol. ii, pt. ii, pp. 78-9; vol. ii, pt. i, p. 410.
142. Parāśara, vol. i. pt. ii. pp. 15-16.
143. Hemādri, vol. iv, p. 382.
144. Parāśara, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 29; pt. i, pp. 410-11.
145. Hemādri, vol. iv. p. 382.
146. Parāśara, vol. i. pt. 1, p. 136.
147. *Śūdra-Kamalākara,* p. 279.
148. The five products of the cow.
149. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri, *Materials for the Study of the Early History of Vaishṇava Sect.* (1920), p. 117.
Nicol Macnicol, *Indian Theism,* (1915), p. 115.
150. Vide *Bhaktavijaya,* by Mahipati (Marathi), edited by L. B. Gokhale, 1888; V. L. Bhawe, *Mahārāshtra Sāraswata* (*Marathi*), vol. I, p. 242.
151. V. L. Bhawe, *Mahārāshtra Sāraswat* (Marathi) vol. i, pp. 70-2.
152. Dāsagupta, pp. 206, 214-15.

153. Parāśara, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 38.
154. J. N. Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, (1920), pp. 244-5.
155. Parāśara, vol. i, pt. ii, pp. 3-5, 15-16.
156. Kanakasabhai, p. 113.
157. Madras Census, 1901, p. 144.
158. *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. x, p. 13.
159. *Śūdra-Kamalākara*, pp. 289-92.
160. Parāśara, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 125.
161. Ibid., pt. i, p. 139.
162. *Vyavahāra-Mayūkha* (Kane's edition, 1926), pp. 5, 215; compare also Medhātithi's comment on Manu, viii, p. 219.
163. *Vyavahāra-Mayūkha*, loc. cit., notes, p. 69.
164. *Dvyāśrayakāvya*, II, p. 520.
165. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i, p. 5.
166. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i, pp. 173-7.
167. *South Indian Inscriptions*, vol. iii, p. 106.
168. Ibid., pp. 21 and 253.
169. Ibid., p. 437.
170. Ibid., p. 268.
171. *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1906-7, p. 243, f.n. 5.
172. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i. pp. 77, 85.
173. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. xv, p. 81.
174. *South Indian Inscriptions*, vol. iii, pp. 114-17.
175. Ibid., pp. 470-1.
176. Ibid., p. 47.
177. Ibid., p. 82.
178. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i, pp. 296, 303, 304; vol. vi, p. 203, and f.n. 3.
179. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 331.
180. Ibid., vol. viii, pp. 206, 208.
181. *Archaeological Survey of Western India, Report*, vol. iii, p. 86.
182. *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. i, pp. 331-3, 336.
183. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 229.
184. Ibid., vol. ii, pp. 409, 420
185. *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, by M. Longworth Dames, vol. ii (1921) pp. 7, 37, 60.
186. R. Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire*, ed. 1924, p. 245.
187. *Ain-i-Akbari*, translated by Jarrett, vol. iii, (1894), p. 118, and vol. ii, pp. 129, 131, 161, 162-3, 164-8, 177, 182, 184, 187, 189, 191, 198, 204-5, 255, 290.
188. *India at the Death of Akbar* (1920), p. 23.
189. *Jehangir's India*, by Moreland and Geyl, (1925), p. 76.
190. *A new account of the East Indies*, by Capt. Alexander Hamilton, vol. i, (1740), p. 151.

5

Race and Caste

Caste is such an obtrusive factor of Indian social organization that since the time of Megasthenes it has never failed to attract the attention of the foreigner—be he traveller, administrator, or student of Sanskrit literature. The application of the sociological method to the explanation of caste, i.e. a systematic attempt to elucidate the genesis and growth of the institution of caste, by a comprehensive study of the contemporary castes, however, may be said to begin with the works of Denzil Ibbetson and J. C. Nesfield. Both of them, in general, endorse the view[1] that caste is mainly occupational in origin, i.e. occupations which were organized into guilds slowly became exclusive and stratified into castes. Nesfield went further and, affirming the essential unity of the Indian race, emphatically denied that racial distinction was the basis of caste.[2] This extraordinary statement of Nesfield led Herbert Risley to use anthropometry for a solution of the riddle of caste, for that alone could decide questions of racial affinity.[3] He carried on extensive measurements on many of the castes of Northern India and published the results of his splendid work in two volumes entitled *Anthropometric Data from Bengal* (1891). The bearing of these data on the theory of caste he discussed in the introduction to his *Tribes and Castes of Bengal,* and later in *The People of India.* His work further led to a succession of monographs on the anthropometric data from other Indian Provinces as a part of the ethnographic survey of India.

In any anthropometric work the student is, at the very outset, faced with two problems. The first is the question of

[1] N.B. This chapter is an adaptation of the author's paper "The Ethnic Theory of Caste", published in *Man in India,* 1924.

the unit. What shall we take as a unit on which measurements may be taken and compared? Shall we take a geographical or political area as our unit and compare one with another? Or shall we take a whole people, and take our measurements on them and then analyse them? The solution of this problem is fundamental to anthropometric work. But as our main purpose is to institute comparisons between castes this problem need not engage us here. We may take one caste as a unit and compare it with another. This procedure does not involve the acceptance of Risley's view about the isolation of castes which, as pointed out by his learned annotator, W. Crooke,[4] requires much modification. We may thus take our measurements on Brahmins and compare them with those on Chamars. But the data show us that neither Brahmins nor Chamars among themselves have a uniform physical type. We ask ourselves the reason of this, and we are led to the question of the origins of the different physical types. Thus we have to deal with the general ethnology of India as, indeed, Herbert Risley did. We have to analyse racial mixture as well as compare different castes.

This procedure opens up the second problem, viz. what is the method by which we can detect racial affinities and compare groups? For such comparisons the average has long been in use. Risley principally used the average for his work, rarely bringing in the seriations and still more rarely the absolute measurements.[5] Seriations, like the frequency curve, only serve the purpose of showing the actual distribution and cannot be conveniently used for purposes of comparison, a fact which explains the rare use of these by Risley when dealing with the types, though they are given in the appendices. The average without the standard deviation is an abstraction which tells us almost nothing. The standard deviation is very useful both as serving the basis of the formula that we have utilized for comparison, as well as giving us an idea of the actual range of variation, "A range of six times the standard deviation usually includes 99 per cent or more of all the observations in the case of distributions of the symmetrical of moderately asymmetrical type."[6] I have

therefore given in the appendix the means and their standard deviations for selected castes.

It will be observed that for the Panjab and Gujarat we have very meagre data: for Sindh proper we have none. For Madras, E. Thurston[7] has given us a long list of averages but very few individual measurements. Hence in the case of Dravidian India we can compare only two castes, data for which are taken from the paper of Sir Thomas Holland. Though we accept Thurston's averages for the general ethnology of India, yet we must point out that they are very crude in so far as the absolute measurements seem to have been recorded in centimetres.[8] For more scientific conclusions about Dravidian India we require fresh measurements taken on typical Dravidian castes.

When we compare two groups, what we want to know is not merely the differences between the two groups as regards the cephalic index or nasal index separately, but we want an expression which conveniently sums up all the differences in the various attributes that we may like to compare. Such an expression was used by T.A. Joyce in 1912. In order to compare two groups he starts with one character, say, the cephalic index, and works out the fraction $\leq \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{o_1^2 + o_2^2}}$ where M_1 and M_2 are the means for the cephalic indices of the two groups, M_1—M_2 is their difference without regard to sign, and o_1, o_2 are the standard deviations. Similar fractions are found for as many characters as one likes, and all of them are added together. This sum is called the "Differential Index".[9] The expression is a convenient quantity showing the actual differentiation of two peoples and can be fruitfully used for comparisons. Another great advantage of this expression is that by its help we can include for comparison absolutes like the cephalic length which have, unfortunately, been too much neglected in anthropological work. Further this item is of special importance in the field of Indian ethnology; for here we have sometimes to deal with two dolichocephalic peoples whose absolute measurements of the head

are essentially different. Thus the Brahmin of U.P. has a cephalic index of 73.29, while his cephalic length and cephalic breadth are 187.56 and 137.42 respectively. The Kurmi, on the other hand, with a cephalic index of 73.25 has the cephalic length of 184.05 and the cephalic breadth of 135.13. The cephalic indices of the Kurmi and the Musahar of Bihar are respectively 75.82 and 75.79. Their cephalic length and cephalic breadth are 186.97 and 183.17, and 141.55 and 138.69 respectively. The Bhil of Khandesh with a cephalic index of 72.56 has the cephalic length of 182.92 and the cephalic breadth of 132.61 but the Kayasth of U.P. with the cephalic index of 72.48 has the cephalic length of 186.62 and the cephalic breadth of 135.42. I have given in the appendix the differential indices for selected castes. In this chapter I have attempted to study the problem of caste with the help of this index.

I have said above that it was Risley who, under special circumstances, applied anthropometry to the solution of the problem of caste. But owing to the method which he followed, the light he was able to throw on the subject was not as decisive as was expected. Again he devoted more attention to the classification and origins of the various physical types of India than to the problem of caste proper.

It may be taken to be an historical fact that peoples calling themselves "Ārya" poured into India through the north-west somewhere about 2000 B.C. It is equally clear from our discussion that an institution closely akin to caste has been very often described in Sanskrit books, which are the works of either the Aryans or the Aryan-inspired aborigines. Can we trace a close connection between the immigration of the Aryans and the rise of the institution of caste? We have seen that the Brahmins, who were the moral guides and legislators of the immigrant Aryans, tried to keep their blood free from any intermixture with the lower classes, though they had no objection to the members of their own class having progeny from females of lower classes, provided these were not admitted into the Brahmin class. Can anthropo-

metry shed any light on this aspect of caste? It appears to me that anthropometry will furnish us with a good guide, provided certain assumptions about the physical types of the Indo-Aryans and of the aborigines of Hindustan can be plausibly made.

These assumptions are two: First, that the Aryan type may be described as long-headed and fine-nosed. The average cephalic index may be said to vary between 70 and 75 and the nasal index from 65 to 75. The ground for this assumption is that almost all the averages of the cephalic index and the nasal index given by Risley[10] for the castes of the Panjab and Rajputana fall within these ranges; and these are the regions which, from their geographical position, must have been the home of Aryan settlements. We may reasonably hold, therefore, that the predominant physical type of the Panjab and Rajputana represents the Aryan type. The second assumption is that the aboriginal type may be deduced from such peoples as the Musahar, who, not being within the pale of Hinduism, are like the jungle-tribes of Southern India. Their chief characteristic is the broad-nose, the nasal index being above 80. Very often the head is long. The broad nose seems to have been noticed even by the Vedic poets as a characteristic of the aborigines, whom they sometimes describe as "noseless".[11]

I can now proceed to set out the conclusions we get from our anthropometrical inquiry. Taking the Brahmin of the United Provinces as the typical representative of the ancient Aryans we shall start comparisons with him. If we turn to the table of differential indices we find that he shows smaller differential index[12] as compared with the Chuhra and the Khatri of the Panjab than with any caste from the United Provinces except the Chhatri. The differential index between the Khatri and the Chuhra is only slightly less than that between the Brahmin of the United Provinces and the Chuhra. This means that the Brahmin of the United Provinces has closer physical affinities with the Chuhra and the Khatri of the Panjab than with any caste from his own province except

the very high caste of the Chhatri. The Brahmin is as much akin to the Chuhra as the latter is to the Khatri of the Panjab. The only valid conclusion is that the United Provinces Brahmin does not materially differ from the physical type of the Panjab, i.e. on the assumption, previously explained, that he fairly represents the physical type of the Aryans. The reality of this close affinity between the United Provinces Brahmin and the Panjab Chuhra is more clearly brought out if we look at the table of differential indices between the United Provinces Brahmin and the Brahmins of other regions. They are very high as compared with that between the Chuhra and the United Provinces Brahmin. Even the differential index between the United Provinces Brahmin and the Bihar Brahmin, who from what we know about the history of the spread of Aryan culture, is expected to be very nearly allied to the former, is just twice as high as that between the United Provinces Brahmin and the Chuhra. This ought to serve as a conclusive proof of the fact that the United Provinces Brahmin has essentially retained the same physical type as that of the Panjabis and of the ancient Aryans.

I must now examine in what relation the United Provinces Brahmin stands to the other castes of his province. From the table of differential indices for the United Provinces we see that in physical affinity with the Brahmin, the Kayasth and the Kurmi stand next to the Chuhra, while at the other end of the scale come the Pasi and the Chamar. In the scheme of social precedence, the Kayasth belongs to the fourth rank, the Kurmi stands at the head of the eighth, while the Pasi and the Chamar take the eleventh and the twelfth rank.[13]

The true significance of this gradation in physical affinity with the Brahmin can be demonstrated by the study of the other provinces. On historical grounds we expect Bihar to approximate to the United Provinces. On referring to the table we find that the Kurmi comes near to the Brahmin, and the Chamar and the Dom stand much differentiated from him. But the Chamar in this case is not as much distinct

from the Brahmin as the United Provinces Chamar is from the United Provinces Brahmin. The social status of the Kurmi is defined by stating that he ranks third while the Chamar and the Dom rank fifth and sixth.[14] Thus in Bihar the state of affairs in some way corresponds to that which we have tried to demonstrate for the United Provinces. The table for Bengal shows that identical conditions do not prevail there. The Chandal, who stands sixth in the scheme of social precedence and whose touch pollutes,[15] is not much differentiated from the Brahmin, from whom the Kayasth, second in rank, can hardly be said to be distinguished. The gradation observed in the United Provinces is thus absent in Bengal. Still more is this the case in Bombay. Here the Deshasth Brahmin bears as close an affinity to the Son Koli, a fisherman caste, as to his own compeer, the Chitpavan Brahmin. The Mahar, the untouchable of the Maratha region, comes next together with the Kunbi, the peasant. Then follow in order the Shenvi Brahmin, the Nagar Brahmin and the high-caste Maratha. These results are rather odd. Stated in a generalized form they mean that there is no correspondence between social gradation and physical differentiation in Bombay. I venture to think that the results from Bengal would have been equally striking if we had data for the various sub-castes of the Brahmins. This contention is rendered plausible by some measurements published by Rai Bahadur Ramaprasad Chanda.[16] The following are the means and their standard deviations:

	Cephalic Index		Nasal Index	
	m.	St. Dev.	m.	St. Dev.
Brahmin (31)	78.84	3.64	75.61	10.31
Paschatya Vaidik Brahmin (50)	79.83	3.56	71.97	8.62

With such differences between the two sub-castes of the Brahmins of Bengal we have reason to expect more startling results than we have, though these are quite insignificant.

Our survey of the regions of India other than Hindustan

has made it abundantly clear that Hindustan is unique in this respect that here we have the Brahmin at the head of the physical hierarchy; then follows a high caste or two, hardly differing from him in physical type; then comes a group of castes, slightly differentiated from the Brahmin; low castes like the Chamar and the Pasi, whom we may look upon as the Hinduized representatives of the aborigines, stand far removed from him.

I shall now turn to the conclusions arrived at by Risley. Believing in the "marked divergence of type that distinguishes the people of the Eastern Punjab from the people of Western Hindustan", to account for the people of Hindustan he brings in a second wave of the Aryans with few or no women. They married aboriginal women and thus modified their original type; "but a certain pride of blood remained to them, and when they had bred females enough to serve their purposes and to establish a distinct *jus connubii* they closed their ranks to all further inter-mixture of blood. When they did this, they became a caste like the castes of the present day".[17] I have shown that as far as the published data go the Hindustani Brahmin does not materially differ from the physical type of the Panjabis. An acute observer of Upper India, W. Crooke, remarked that a traveller from the Panjab glides into Hindustan without marking any change in the physical type.[18] It is, therefore, not necessary to postulate a second invasion of the Aryans, who could not bring their women-folk with them.[19] Nor need we propose a theory entirely contradictory to the literary records of the Brahmins.

There is another proposition of Risley's which I must examine more minutely, for it is one which, if true to facts, affects my conclusion. He observes, "If we take a series of castes in Bengal, Bihar, the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, or Madras, and arrange them in the order of the average nasal index so that the caste with the finest nose shall be at the top, and that with the coarsest at the bottom of the list, it will be found that this order substantially corres-

ponds with the accepted order of social precedence".[20] In the argument elaborated above it is evident that we depend upon the uniqueness of Hindustan amongst the provinces of India as regards the gradation of the physical type for our explanation of the origin of endogamy. The statement of Risley in a way challenges that basis. For Bengal and Bombay I think I have made a good case, and my figures will speak for themselves; but as regards Madras, for lack of material, I have not been able to apply the formula for differential index. It may be urged against me that as far as nasal index, without the absolute measurements of the nose, can be an indication of racial mixture, Madras seriously damages my argument. I shall therefore examine the association between nasal index and social status province by

province.

Risley, after comparing the nasal indices of some of the castes of Hindustan, says that the order of gradation established by means of the nasal index is "substantially" the same as that of social precedence.[21] This mild statement has been reproduced in an exaggerated form in an authoritative book on ethnology. It is said in Keane's *Man Past and Present*[22] that the Hindustani type of the United Provinces has "a nose index exactly corresponding to social station". I shall presently show that Risley's statement is only partially true, and that Keane's generalization has no ground. The following is the order in which some of the typical castes of the United Provinces stand according to their nasal index as given in my table for the province: Babhan, Brahmin, Chhatri, Kayasth, Kurmi, Tharu, Bania, Bhar, Kol, Lohar, Dom, Pasi, Musahar and Chamar. The order of social precedence as given in the Census Report of 1901[23] is as follows: Brahmin, Babhan, Rajput, Kayasth, Bania, Kurmi and Lohar, Mallah and Bind, etc., Bhar and Tharu, etc., Kol and Muchi, etc., Pasi and Dosadh, etc., Chamar, Musahar and Dom, etc. To these I may add Kachhi, Lodha, and Koiri. Risley's[24] averages for their nasal index are: 82.9, 83.4 and 83.6. In my list the first two will rank after Kol and the third after Lohar. But in the scheme of social precedence they are

grouped together with Kurmi. These comparisons prove that the statement of Keane is baseless and that of Risley is true only in a broad sense. For Bengal Risley's[25] averages give us the following order: Brahmin of Eastern Bengal and Kayasth, Brahmin of Western Bengal, Chandal and Sadgop, Goala, Muchi, Pod, Kaibart, and Rajbansi Kochh. These castes may be arranged according to social status as: Brahmin, Kayasth and others, Sadgop and others, Kaibarta and Goala, Bhuiya and others, Kochh, and Pod, Chandal, Muchi and others.[26] It is evident that these lists disprove Risley's statement. On Risley's[27] averages for Orissa some of the castes rank as below: Shashan Brahmin, Panda Brahmin and Teli, Khandait, Mastan Brahmin and Guria, and Chasa, Karan, Pan, Kewat, and Bauri. The social order of precedence is: Brahmin, Karan, Khandait and others, Chasa, Guria and others, Gola and others, Teli and Kewat, etc., Chamar, Bauri and others, Pan and others.[28] I leave out Bombay, as it is not included in Risley's observation. By looking at the table the reader can satisfy himself that the figures for Bombay are more telling than in the case of the provinces so far dealt with. Finally we come to Madras. Here we must treat of the different linguistic areas separately for the schemes of social precedence in the various areas are different. I shall begin with the Telugu region. According to the averages given by Risley (p. 398) and by E. Thurston (vol. i, pp. lxviii-lxxiii) the order of castes is as follows: Kapu, Sale, Golla, Mala, Madiga and Togata, and Komati. According to their social status they are ranked as below: Brahmin . . . Komati, Golla and Kapu and others, and Sale, Togata and others. Mala and Madiga occupy the lowest rank, being the Pariahs of the Telugu country.[29] In the Canarese region the nasal index gives the following order: Karnatak Smarta Brahmin, Bant, Billava, Mandya Brahmin, Vakkaliga, Ganiga, Linga-Banajiga, Panchala, Kuruba, Holeya, Deshasth Brahmin, Toreya, and Bedar. In the scheme of social precedence the castes take the ranks as under: Brahmin . . . Bant and Vakkaliga, Toreya, etc., Kuruba and Ganiga, Badaga and Kurumba and Solaga, Billava, Bedar and Holeya.[30] The significance of the comparison is enhanced when we remember

that the nasal index of the Holeya, the untouchable of the Canarese region, is 75.1, that of the highest sub-caste of the Brahmin being 71.5, while those of the jungle Kurumba and the Solaga, who when Hinduized, occupy the rank allotted to them in the list, are 86.1 and 85.1 respectively. The ranks of the Linga-Banajiga and the Panchala cannot be determined, as they do not recognize the authority of the Brahmin. The Tamil castes may be arranged according to their nasal index as follows: Ambattan, Vellal, Idaiyan, Agamudaiyan, Tamil Brahmin, Palli, Malaiyali, Shanan, Paraiyan, Irula, and Malasar. The social ranking of these castes is: Brahmin, Idaiyan and Vellala, Agamudaiyan and Palli, Ambattan and others, Irula and Malasar and Malaiyali, Shanan and others, Paraiyan.[31] The nasal indices of four typical Malayalam castes are: Tiyan, 75; Nambudiri Brahmin, 75.5[32]; Nayar, 76.7; Cheruman, 77.2. The order of social precedence among these is: Nambudiri, Nayar, Tiyan, and Cheruman. The nasal index of the Kanikar, a jungle tribe of Travancore, is 84.6. Thus the Cheruman belongs to the same race as the Brahmin rather than to that of the Kanikar. I hope these comparisons will have made it abundantly clear that the proposition of Risley has almost no basis in fact outside Hindustan.

Outside Hindustan in each of the linguistic areas we find that the physical type of the population is mixed, and does not conform in its gradation to the scale of social precedence of the various castes. The Brahmin is not so far distinguished in his physical features from other castes as to stand out apart from them and at the head of the physical hierarchy. Some of the castes, very low in their social status, actually stand higher in physical features than some of the higher castes. In Hindustan, on the other hand, the gradation of physical types from the Brahmin downwards to Musahar corresponds very closely to the scheme of social precedence prevailing among the Hindustani castes. The state of things can be the result only of such regulations that prevented the possibility of Brahmin blood being mixed with aboriginal blood but allowed the mixture of blood of the

other groups in varying proportions. As we have seen, this was just what the Brahmins attempted to do by their rules of conduct. The Brahmin kept himself pure by decreeing that only those persons both of whose parents were Brahmins were to be regarded as Brahmins. Thus the Brahmins were the first to be endogamous with reference to their class. We have also seen that the Brahmins of each of the linguistic areas show greater physical affinity with other castes of their region than with the Brahmins of other areas and of Hindustan. It is clear from this that the Brahmanic practice of endogamy must have been developed in Hindustan and thence conveyed as a cultural trait to the other areas without a large influx of the physical type of the Hindustani Brahmins.

The treatment of the subject cannot be complete without an investigation of the physical types of India and their origins.[33] In this field also a lead has been given by Risley. It is best to start with a statement of his view. He distinguishes seven types: (1) The Turko-Iranian of Baluchistan and North-West Frontier Provinces. We do not discuss this type, because we think that it essentially lies outside cultural India. (2) The Indo-Aryan type of Kashmir, Panjab, and Rajputana. It is dolichocephalic with a narrow nose. We leave out other physical characteristics as they are far too vague. (3) The Mongoloid type of the Himalayas, Nepal, Assam, and Burma. (4) The Dravidian type extending from Ceylon to the valley of the Ganges and pervading the whole of Madras, Hyderabad, and the Central Provinces, most of Central India and Chota-Nagpur. It was "probably the original type of the population of India". It is dolichocephalic with a "very broad nose". (5) The Aryo-Dravidian type of the United Provinces, Bihar and Ceylon. It is also found in parts of Rajputana. The head-form is long with a tendency to medium. (6) The Mongolo-Dravidian type of Lower Bengal and Orissa. "The head is broad; nose medium with a tendency to broad." (7) The Scytho-Dravidian type of Western India. "The head is broad; nose moderately fine."[34]

The Indo-Aryan type: The first objection against this type

is that the term used to denote it in the scheme proposed by Risley is unsatisfactory. In the case of the other types the names are compound terms composed of the names for the two physical types from which the particular type is supposed to be derived. Thus what is meant by the term Aryo-Dravidian is that the type is considered to be a mixture of the Aryan type and the Dravidian type. But in the case of the Indo-Aryan type no such mixture is meant. The Indo-Aryan type is not to be understood to be a mixture of the Indian and Aryan but to be a pure type. Indo-Aryan means nothing more than the Aryan of India as opposed to the Aryan of Iran. Thus it will be seen that in Risley's scheme the term is rather misleading. Nevertheless, as in my treatment of the subject I wish to avoid all compound terms I shall retain the term Indo-Aryan to denote the Aryan type of India. Instead I cannot use the term Aryan, for in philology it is generally applied to the Iranians as well as to the Indians. By Indo-Aryan, then, I mean the physical type to which the Vedic Indians largely contributed. The physical characteristics of this type are solely inferred from those of the present population of the Panjab. I have no reason to think that after the Aryan immigration into India and before Darius' dominion there was any considerable influx of foreigners. When Darius held sway over a part of the Panjab the country appears to have been already very populous and prosperous.[35] The physical type of the Panjab is so uniform as to preclude any possibility of large mixture. Hence we can reasonably assume that a large bulk of the present inhabitants of the Panjab are the descendants of the Vedic Aryans. Their number might have swollen by later immigrants whose physical type must have been similar to theirs but whose cultural affinities we may not be able to trace. Secondly, an objection has been levelled at Risley's classification of the Rajputs as Indo-Aryans.[36] It has been contended that some of the clan-names of the Rajputs are the same as those of the Gurjara tribe or caste and that the reigning dynasty of Kanauj during the ninth century and after was of the Gurjara stock. Hence it is argued that some of the Rajput clans are of non-Aryan descent.[37] Even

the Minas and Meos of Rajputana are not physically much differentiated from the Rajputs.[38] The Rajputs are thus of the same race as the other peoples of Rajputana. We cannot hold that Rajputana was untenanted before the foreign tribes entered it in the sixth century A.D. Perhaps it will be said that the Gurjaras were of the same physical type as the population of Rajputana and hence their presence cannot be detected by physical anthropology, though they had come in large numbers and produced the present population of Rajputana. This supposition is not tenable; for the Gurjaras are believed to be allied in blood to the White Huns,[39] who seem to have been a brachycephalic people.[40] It is reasonable therefore to assume that a few ruling families of the Gurjaras with a small band of followers succeeded in gaining ascendance and imposing their culture over the then population of Rajputana. It is also urged that some of the Rajput clans "are descended from the so-called aboriginal tribes—Gonds, Bhars, Kols and the like",[41] apparently because both the Rajputs and the aboriginal tribes have certain clan-names in common. In physical characteristics these tribes are sharply distinguished from the Rajputs, and yet we are asked to believe that they are essentially the same because some features of social organization are common to both. The common clan-names can better be explained as a borrowing by the lowly castes or tribes from the dominant Rajputs. Thus there does not appear to be any serious objection to the Rajputs being classed as Indo-Aryans. Thirdly, there does not seem to be any foundation for Risley's classification of the Kashmiris as Indo-Aryans. The Kashmiris appear to be a mesaticephalic people, perhaps a mixture of the Alpine folk of Central Asia and the Indo-Aryans of the Panjab. Lastly, I have made it clear that Risley was not right in restricting the type to the Panjab and Rajputana. The type includes one or two high castes of Hindustan as well.

As regards the affinities of Indo-Aryans outside India, Dr. Haddon would perhaps see in them modified Proto-Nordics.[42] But it is better to connect them with the tall

variety of the Mediterranean Race.

The Mongoloid type: Here we have no comment to make except to draw attention to a mistake of Risley,[43] repeated in *Man Past and Present*.[44] Both the Kanets of Kulu and Lahoul are there classed as Mongoloid. A glance at the table for the Panjab will show that whereas the Kulu Kanets are very much akin to the Khatri of the Panjab, the Lahoul Kanets are quite distinct from them. The Kanets of Kulu are Indo-Aryans, while the Kanets of Lahoul are a mixture of the Kulu Kanets with the Mongoloid folk. Indeed, it was to elucidate the process of racial mixture between the Kanets of Kulu (who show marked points of contact with the Panjabis) and the Mongoloids that Holland, our authority on the subject, undertook a study of these two peoples.[45]

The Dravidian type: Here we come upon the weakest part of Risley's great work. The type is supposed to spread from Ceylon to the valley of the Ganges, the best representatives of it being Nayars, Paniyans, Santals, and others.[46] This view has been repeated in *Man Past and Present*,[47] where though the jungle tribes like the Paniyans are classed apart as Pre-Dravidian, the Nayars and the Santals are given as the typical representatives of the Dravidian type. Now even if we leave aside complexion, the Santal stands as far apart from the Nayar as the Paniyan. The nasal index of the Nayar is 76.7; that of the Santal, 88.8; that of the Paniyan, 95.1. The close connection of the Santal with the jungle tribes of Southern India comes out more clearly if we take into account other tribes like the Irula and the Kanikar. It may be broadly stated that the nasal index of the jungle tribes ranges from 80 to 90. I have therefore to connect the Santal with the jungle tribes and separate the Nayar and others like him from them.

I propose to break up this composite group into four distinct types:—

(a) The Pre-Dravida type.
(b) The Munda type.
(c) The Dravida type.
(d) The Western type.

Before dealing with the types I must make a note about the use of certain terms. The Malayalam and the Tamil regions seem to have been collectively referred to by Sanskrit writers as "Dravida desa", i.e. the Dravid country, as opposed to the "Andhra desa" or the Telugu country. The type that I propose to designate Dravida is predominant only in the Malayalam and the Tamil regions. Hence it should be deservedly called the Dravida type. "Dravidian" is only an anglicized form of the word "dravida". But in philology it has been used to denote not only Tamil and Malayalam but Canarese, Telugu, and kindred languages. It is also employed to designate a culture different from the Aryan culture. It is convenient to retain this word to denote a culture which in its social organization was characterized at one end by such practices as cross-cousin marriage and at the other by dual organization and matrilineal descent.

(a) The Pre-Dravida type: The characteristic representatives of this type inhabit mostly the jungles of Southern India. They are also found in Western India, in the hilly country of Central India, in Rajputana, and the United Provinces, everywhere penetrating like a wedge. Such a distribution makes it probable that these people were the first occupants of Southern India. Being pressed by later immigrants they seem to have taken to the hills and jungles, or again managed to become low members of the social polity of the immigrants. The immigrants who pressed upon them were the people of the Dravida type. Hence the name of the type under consideration. If we regard the Irula, the Kadir, the Kanikar, the Paniyan and the like as the best representatives of this type, its physical characteristics may be thus summed up: the head is long, the cephalic index being generally below 75; the nose broad, the nasal index being always above 80. The Bhil and the Katkari of Western India are members of this racial stock. The Musahar, the Pasi, the Chamar, and the low castes in general of the United Provinces belong to the same type. From the fact that among the Kanikars of the hills the system of inheritance is from father to son, only a portion of the personal property

being given to the nephew, while among those of the plains an equal distribution of one's self-acquired property is made between the sons and the nephews,[48] it is reasonable to assume that the pre-Dravida people were essentially patrilineal. When they moved northwards they seem to have imbibed many of the items of the Dravidian culture. They carried with them the practice of raising megalithic tombs and monuments, which are found in the Central Provinces, Eastern Rajputana, and the Mirzapur District of the United Provinces. They spoke Dravidian languages; for some of the names of the villages in the Central Provinces end in a Canarese termination[49] and some village-names in the districts of Gaya and Mirzapur are distinctly Dravidian.[50] As for social organization they seem to have carried the practice of cross-cousin marriage, which now exists among them for the most part as a survival.[51]

This type has till now been known as pre-Dravidian. Some authorities connect these people with the Sakai of the Malay Peninsula and the Australians.[52] They might have been the autochthones of India. That there is a negrito strain in this type is rendered probable by the researches of Dr. B. S. Guha.[53]

(b) The Munda type: Peoples having a very slight tendency towards mesaticephaly and a broad-nose, nasal index above 80, are massed together in Chota-Nagpur and Western Bengal. They are also found in Bihar, but not in the United Provinces.[54] In this region Munda culture seems to have originally flourished.[55] Hence it is best to designate the type as the Munda type. Some of the peoples belonging to this type speak Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages. In culture the Munda peoples have affinities with the Indonesian and the Melanesian regions. That this Munda culture had a far wider distribution than at present is certain because "Munda languages must once have been spoken over a wide area in Central India, and probably also in the Ganges Valley".[56] Further, some of the names of villages in the districts of Gaya and Mirzapur are Munda in origin.[57] The

Munda languages are closely related to the Mon-Khmer languages spoken by the Sakais and Semangs of the Malay Peninsula and are further connected with the languages of Indonesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia in such a manner as to allow us to group them together as one family.[58] A survival of a peculiar custom, viz. the marriage of grandfather with his grand-daughter, is confined only to this part of India. The existence of it among the Oraons was first made known by Rai Bahadur S. C. Roy. A counterpart of it is known from Melanesia.[59] Roy has also noticed certain practices from Bihar which are reminiscent of this survival.[60] Another sort of survival of this curious custom is reported from Ganjam, where even now a Munda language is spoken. Among the Sollokhondia section of the Gaudo caste if a girl fails to secure a husband before puberty she has to go through a nominal marriage with an old man, "preferably the girl's grandfather."[61] A similar practice prevails amongst the Kurumo of Ganjam.[62] The custom of marriage between the grand-daughter and the grandfather must have formed part of the Munda culture. A neolithic artefact known as the "shouldered celt" is peculiar to the highlands of Bengal and Assam. Identical tools are found in the Malayan region.[63] The limited distribution of this implement in India lends support to the conclusion that the people who brought it to India must have come from the Malayan region. Further as the tool is not found west of the area characterized by the Munda culture it is reasonable to suppose that the Munda people were responsible for the introduction of this artefact. The conclusion about the origin of the Munda type is that the people of this type came into India from the Malayan region when they were in the Neolithic Age.

The typical representative of this type are the Munda, the Santal, the Musahar, and the Chamar of Bihar.

(c) The Dravida type: This type is characterized by a long head, the cephalic index being below 75, and by a medium nose, the nasal index being less than 77. It is restricted to the Tamil and Malayalam countries.[64] Matrilineal

descent seems to have been the chief characteristic of the social organization of the peoples of this type. A statement of Megasthenes is construed to refer to this peculiarity of the social organization of Malabar.[65] A physical trait which we have not so far taken into consideration is the hair. It is of special importance in connection with the inquiry of the affinities of this type. Most castes of Malabar excepting the Nambudiri have little or no hair on the cheeks and the chest. They are clean-shaven, and the Nambudiri imitating them shaves all his body excepting the top-knot. "Amongst the people of good caste in Malabar, to speak of one as a hairy man is to speak of him reproachfully."[66] This lack of hair on the cheeks definitely connects the Dravidas with the Brown Race as it is characterized by Elliot Smith.[67] When they came to India from Mesopotamia or Arabia, cannot be ascertained. They might have brought with them the matrilineal type of social organization from these countries; for there is some evidence for thinking that both the Arabs and the Babylonians practised mother-right.[68]

The best representatives of this type are: The Nayar, the Tiyan, the Badaga, the Agamudaiyan, and the Vellala. I exclude the Nambudiris from this type because their cephalic index is above 75, and they are extremely hairy. The Todas are a problem. Their cephalic and nasal indices are such as to include them under this type; but their hairy system is particularly well developed. Rivers connects them with the Malabar castes and attributes their hairiness to their environment.[69] Against this explanation R. Chanda has justly urged that the Badagas, another tribe of the Nilgiris, do not seem to be hairy.[70] In view of the fact that "of all the castes or tribes of Malabar, the Nambudiris perhaps show the greatest number of resemblances to the customs of the Todas"[71] it is not unlikely that they might have some connection with the Nambudiris.

(d) The Western type: I shall deal with this type in connection with the Scytho-Dravidian type of Risley.

The Aryo-Dravidian type: As the discussion so far must have made it clear we cannot speak of any Aryo-Dravidian type. I have shown that the high castes of the United Provinces (and perhaps also of Bihar) must be classed as Indo-Aryan. The lower castes of the United Provinces must be referred to the pre-Dravidian type and those of Bihar to the Munda type. That we must separate the low castes of Bihar from those of the United Provinces is made clear by the differential index. The differential index between the Brahmins of the two provinces is 2.05; that between the Kurmis is 3.49; and that between the Chamars is 4.01. The intermediate castes of the United Provinces must be considered to be the result of a mixture between the Indo-Aryan and the pre-Dravidas, while those of Bihar that of the Indo-Aryans and the Mundas, with perhaps a pre-Dravida strain.

The Mongolo-Dravidian type: This type, according to Risley, is a mixture of the pure Mongoloid and Dravidian types and comprises the population of Lower Bengal and Orissa. He describes the head of this type as broad, but I think it would be better to describe it as medium. Of the fourteen castes of Bengal measured by Risley the cephalic indices ranged from 74.9 to 78.8, the lower castes like the Bauri, Mal Paharia, Bagdi, Goala and Mal, Kaibart and Muchi having the lower indices and Sadgop, Chandal of the lower castes and Kayasth and Brahmin of the high ones having the higher ones. Only the Rajbansi Maghs of the Chittagong Hills show a cephalic index of over 79; and they are essentially Mongoloid. The nasal indices of the above fourteen castes ranged between 70.7 to 94.7. The lower indices are shown in the ascending order by Kayasth, Brahmin, Sadgop and Chandal, etc. The Bagdi has the nasal index of 80.8 and the Bauri, the Mal Paharia and the Mal follow in the ascending order.[72] The nasal index of the Mongoloid type in India is in most cases above 78.[73] Nor does the orbito-nasal index support any idea of a Mongoloid mixture.[74] In three lower castes of Bengal—the Pod, the Bagdi, and the Chandal—the figures are: 111.5, 112.2, and

114.0. In Orissa the orbito-nasal index varies from 112 to 117. We do not wish to imply that there is no Mongoloid mixture in this part of India, but only to point out that the published data of anthropometry do not give us any clue. The Savaras of Ganjam are distinctly Mongoloid.[75] Again some of the castes of the United Provinces show marked cultural affinities with the Mongoloid peoples. Among the Bahelias, Dhangars, Dharkars, Dombs, Dusadhs, and Nais, marriage is permitted in the line of one's mother's sister.[76] Everywhere else in India such marriages are strictly prohibited; hence the permission for such marriages among these castes is very unusual. We can explain it only as a borrowing from the Mongoloid people, the Bhotias of Sikkim. Among them one can marry one's cousin on the maternal side, either mother's brother's child or mother's sister's child.[77] I think that the Bengalis are only an extension of the Western type. Sailendranath Sengupta's[78] recent appraisal of the racial situation that "the brachycephaly among the higher castes can be reasonably supposed to be due to the admixture only of an adventitious element from the West," does not militate against this conclusion. The differential index shows that the Bengal Brahmin is more nearly related to the Shenvi and the Chitpavan Brahmins of Bombay than to the Bihar Brahmin and far more so than to the United Provinces Brahmin. There is evidence to show that the people of Bengal have affinities with the Dravidian culture. The use in marriage of the Chank-bangles even by the Brahmins is an instance in point.[79] Risley thinks that there is "a strain of Indo-Aryan blood in the higher groups".[80] In view of the fact that the differential index between the Bengal Brahmin and the Chandal is 1.11, while between him and the United Provinces Brahmin is 3.89, there does not seem any ground for this supposition. In Orissa there appears to be some mixture of the Munda type, because the nasal index is sometimes very high. The people of Bengal and Orissa, therefore, would best be regarded as a mixture of the Western and the Munda types slightly modified in some cases by the Mongoloid type.

The Scytho-Dravidian type: What Risley exactly meant by the term Scythian is not clear. He could not have meant Mongoloid, for then there would have been no point in distinguishing this type from the Mongolo-Dravidian. Perhaps he used the word as equivalent to the Sakas of Sanskrit writers. That there is no evidence of the Sakas having reached so far as this type stretches is amply proved.[81] We must, therefore, give up this designation of the type. I propose to call it the Western type, because it characterizes the Western Coast from Gujarat to South Canara, and thence spreads inwards into Coorg, Mysore, the Deccan, and the Telugu country and through Orissa into Bengal. The head is mostly medium with a slight tendency towards broad; the nasal index in most communities is below 78. Representatives of this type are: Sale, Bant, Vakkaliga, Coorga, Shenvi, Prabhu, Nagar, Chitpavan, Mala, Madiga, and Holeya. Chanda seeks to connect the Gujaratis, the Marathis, and the Bengalis with a people of the Alpine Race that, he supposes, came from Chinese Turkistan. And he has the support of no less an authority than Dr. Haddon, who first postulated an immigration of the Alpine folks to account for the "strongly marked brachycephalic element in the population of Western India."[82] Against this route of immigration it must be objected that if the Alpine people came through Kashmir and the Panjab, how is it that we have no trace of either brachycephaly or mesaticephaly in the intervening area till we come to Gujarat? Further, the highest cephalic indices are recorded from the southern part of the region characterized by this type, i.e. from Bellary. The distribution of the type sketched above suggests quite a different route of immigration, i.e. on the western coast by sea. Most of the castes are mesaticephalic and nine of the castes of the Marathi region, pooled together, give 77.84 as the mean cephalic index. It is therefore more reasonable to seek the origin of this type in a mixed stock rather than in a purely Alpine one, for the latter has a very broad head, the cephalic index being often 85 and upwards.[83] Western Asia seems to provide us with such a people; for there we notice a prolonged process of mixture between the Brown race and the

Alpine race.[84] Schoff sees in Cutch or Kachh reminiscences of the Kassites who migrated from Elam about 2200 B.C.[85] H.J.E. Peake thinks that about 2000 B.C. some of the Nordics had made their appearance in Asia Minor.[86] If some of them accompanied the people who landed on the western coast of India, we can explain the colour of the eyes of the Chitpavans of Bombay. It is greenish grey rather than blue. Their eyes are known in Marathi as "cat-eyes".[87]

Giuffrida-Ruggeri has suggested the following classification of the ethnic elements in India: (a) Negritos. Apparently there are no representatives of these. He thinks that they survive in tribes like the Bhils, the Gonds, etc.[88] (b) Pre-Dravidians (Australoid-Veddaic); (c) Dravidians. They are connected with the Ethiopians, with the exception of the Somalis and Gallas.[89] Under this category he includes the mesaticephalic and the brachycephalic peoples of the Canarese-Telugu regions.[90] Being afraid of sea migration—witness his gibe at Elliot Smith[91]—he brings the Dravidians into India from Iran, and explains the "elevation of the cephalic index among the inhabitants of the south by a mixture with the brachycephalic Negritos, the most ancient population between India and the Persian Gulf".[92] He entirely misses the significance of the distribution of the dolichocephalic and mesaticephalic types explained above. (d) Tall dolichocephalic elements (Toda),[93] (e) dolichocephalic Aryans. Under this class he includes Kafirs, Dards, Rajputs, and the Kanet of Lahoul.[94] (f) Brachycephalic Leucoderms. He accepts the hypothesis of Chanda,[95] about immigration of the Alpine folk. It will have been quite clear from my discussion that such a classification is untenable. The ascertained facts of Indian anthropometry are far better accommodated by the classification that emerges out of my discussion.

I should distinguish six main physical types among the Hindu population of India. These are: (1) The Indo-Aryan; (2) pre-Dravida; (3) the Dravida; (4) the Western; (5) the Munda; and (6) the Mongoloid. The Indo-Aryan type is confined to the Panjab, Rajputana, and part of the United

Provinces, and is mixed with the pre-Dravida and Munda types in the last province among its lower classes. The Munda type centres round Chota-Nagpur. The population of Bihar is formed by the mixture of three types, viz. the Indo-Aryan, the pre-Dravida, and the Munda, while that of Bengal and Orissa combines the Western, the Munda, and the Mongoloid types. The Mongoloid proper is confined to the Himalayas, Nepal, and Assam. The Western type is found on the western coast right up to the northern limits of Malabar, in Mysore and the Telugu country, and in the whole of Maharashtra. The Dravida type makes up the population of the Tamil and Malayalam speaking districts of the south, excepting the rudest hill-tribes. The jungle folks of South India generally represent the pre-Dravida type.

Von Eickstedt writing in 1933 came to the conclusion that six main racial types can be clearly distinguished and, though he named them rather fancifully, he showed their equivalence to the types mentioned above.[96] Dr. B. S. Guha's conclusions on the basis of his measurements taken as an accompaniment of the Census of 1931 cannot be taken *in toto* owing to serious defects in the conduct of the survey. As pointed out by me[97] the groups chosen were not proper, the individuals measured were not adequate in number and perhaps the individuals were not always representative of the group.

1. Risley, (2), pp. 263-5.
2. Ibid., p. 265.
3. Ibid., p. 20.
4. Ibid., p. xvii.
5. Op. cit., p. 37.
6. Yule, *An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics*, 1916, p. 40.
7. Vol. i, p. xi.
8. Ibid., pp. lv, lxi.
9. JRAI., 1912, p. 451.
   N.B.—Dr. B. S. Guha in his dissertation on the Racial Affinities of the Peoples of India (*Census of India*, 1931, vol. I, Part III, Ethnographical, 1933) used the more elaborate for-

mula devised by Karl Pearson much after the time when I had to use the only formula then in existence. The new formula was called the Coefficient of Racial Likeness. Dr. Guha in using it further employed a correcting factor for the differing number of individuals as introduced by Pearson and called the Reduced Coefficient of Racial Likeness (p. vii). In 1936 Prof. R. A. Fisher in his paper contributed to the *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* criticized the use of the C.R.L. as a measure of affinity and distance and stressed the point that the formula only indicated divergence or otherwise from a particular universe. He remarked: "As has been explained above, it is the function of a test of significance to measure a probability, and not to afford an estimate of a metrical difference It is, therefore, somewhat unfortunate that the name assigned to the Coefficient of Racial Likeness does suggest, to many who first hear of it, that it affords a measure of the differences, or inversely of the likenesses, between different races" (p. 60)

In 1949 Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis (*Sankhya*, vol. 9, pp. 237ff) levelled the same criticism against "the Pearsonian C.R L." pointing out the main defect to be the fact that it does not take note of the differing sizes of samples, a point which he had already made in 1930 (*Biometrika*, vol. 22, p. 98). He does not refer to the above-mentioned paper of Prof. Fisher nor does he refer to the Reduced Coefficient of Racial Likeness used by Dr. Guha, in which correction for differing number is employed. He devised a new formula which he calls D^2 and used it in his work *U.P. Anthropometric Survey*, 1941 (*Sankhya*, vol. 9, pp. 111-202).

Further it has to be pointed out here that the results of the somatometric study of two Andhra workers refute Dr. Guha's confirmation of the dolichocephalic character of the Telugu head. In their paper read before the Anthropological Section of the Indian Science Congress in 1937 R. K. Rao and A. Ananthanarayan Iyer show from the somatometric study of two hundred students representing mostly the intelligentsia of Andhradesa along with others that "the dominant head form is *mesaticephalic* with an average over 76 and that the mean nasal index is 73."

10. *Op.* cit., Appendix, iii, p. 396.
11. *Vedic Index*, *vide* Dasyu.
12. I have used only those differential indices which are based on six characters.
13. *United Provinces Census Report*, 1901, p. 248.
14. *Bengal Census Report*, 1901, p. 373.
15. Ibid., p. 369.
16. pp. 255-57.

17. (2), pp. 56, 274-5.
18. *Northern India*, 1907, p. 107.
19. The hypothesis of two or three Aryan inroads has been examined by the author in his paper "The Ethnic Theory of Caste", published in *Man in India*, 1924.
20. Op. cit., p. 29.
21. Op. cit., p. 40.
22. p. 546.
23. p. 248.
24. Op. cit., p. 400.
25. p. 401.
26. *Bengal Census Report*, 1901, p. 369.
27. Op. cit., p. 401.
28. *Bengal Census Report*, 1901, p. 375.
29. *Madras Census Report*, 1901, pp. 136-7.
30. Ibid., pp. 136-9.
31. Ibid., p. 31.
32. Rivers, *The Todas*, p. 708.
33. In my discussion of the physical types I have confined my remarks to the Hindu population.
34. Risley, (2), pp. 33-4.
35. *Cambridge History of India*, vol. i, pp. 335-7.
36. Risley, p. xx.
37. V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, 1914, pp. 411-14.
38. Risley, p. 396.
39. Smith, op. cit., p. 321.
40. Keane, p. 326.
41. V. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 413.
42. *Wanderings of Peoples*, pp. 26-7.
43. p. 34.
44. p. 547.
45. J.R.A.I. 1902, pp. 114, 120.
46. Risley (2), pp. 34-5.
47. p. 347.
48. Thurston, op. cit., iii, p. 169.
49. *Central Provinces District Gazetteers*: *Chanda*, p. 123.
50. J.A.S.B. 1903, pt. iii, pp. 92-3.
51. J.R.A.S. 1907, p. 626.
52. Keane, p. 422.
53. *Nature*, 1929, pp. 942-3.
54. Risley, pp. 399-400.
55. Haddon, p. 26.
56. *Linguistic Survey of India*, iv, p. 9.
57. J.A.S.B. 1903, pt. iii, pp. 92-3.
58. *Linguistic Survey of India*, iv, p. 14, and f.n. p. 21.
59. S. C. Roy, *The Oraons*, pp. 352-4.
60. Ibid.

61. Thurston, op. cit., ii, p. 276.
62. Ibid., vol. iv, p. 179.
63. *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, i, p. 165.
64. Thurston, op. cit., p. 41.
65. W. Logan, *Malabar*, i, p. 247.
66. *Madras Museum Bulletin*, vol. iii, p. 38
67. *The Ancient Egyptians*, pp. 50-62.
68. H. Schaeffer, *The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites*, p. 3.
69. *The Todas*, p. 708.
70. *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, vol. viii,, p. 300.
71. *The Todas*, p. 709.
72. *Sankhya*, I, pp. 76-105.
73. Risley, p. 402.
74. Ibid., p. 31.
75. Thurston, op. cit., vi. p. 312.
76. *U.P. Census Report*, 1911, p. 212.
77. *Bengal Census Report*, 1911, p. 326.
78. *Census, West Bengal*, 1951, *Tribes and Castes of West Bengal*, (1953), p. 383.
79. J. Hornell, *The Sacred Chank of India*, pp. 145-6.
80. Op. cit., p. 33.
81. Risley, (2), p. xx.
82. Op. cit., p. 27, and Map 1.
83. Keane, p. 438.
84. Elliot Smith, op. cit., p. 136.
85. *The Periplus of the Erythrean Sea*, p. 134.
86. J.R.A.I. 1916, p. 172, and Map 2.
87. *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. x, p. 111, f.n. 3.
88. *Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, v, p. 226.
89. Ibid., p. 219.
90. Ibid., p. 222.
91. Ibid., p. 233.
92. Ibid., p. 216.
93. Ibid., p. 220.
94. Ibid., p. 256.
95. Ibid., p. 216.
96. L. A. Krishna Iyer, *The Travancore Tribes and Castes*, vol. II, pp. xlix, liv.
97. *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, vol. XVII.

6

Elements Of Caste Outside India

With the elements of Indian caste before us it will be instructive to see if any one or many of them in combination characterize any other community, civilized or tribal. In our quest for these elements we shall pass under review Egypt, Western Asia, China, Japan, America, and the tribal peoples on the one hand and Rome and tribal Europe on the other.

In Egypt during the Pyramid age there were three principal classes—the land-owners, the serfs and the slaves, the last two being distinguished from the first by the fact of their owning no land.[1] During the Eighteenth Dynasty, to judge from the classification made in an official census, there seem to have been at least four classes. They were the soldiers—who included among them all free persons of the middle class, not engaged in any of the other callings—the priests, the craftsmen, and the serfs. The first two classes had so many common interests that they were clearly distinguished from the rest.[2] Yet in actual influence and possession of wealth the clergy were far superior to the soldiers.[3] And they had by then formed themselves into a huge sacerdotal organization.[4] The social situation is thus summarized by Petrie: "When we look at the various classes of the country, it is evident that there was, very naturally, a large amount of hereditary succession to office and to business. We see the same in England or any other country, although every one is free to change his occupation as he prefers. In Egypt, on the contrary, no artisan was allowed to have another trade or employment, or be reckoned in any other class. Hence, once in a trade, it was impossible to move out of it, and the natural facility of a boy learning his father's trade tended to fix each generation into the same line. Thus

the impression which the Greeks received when stepping into such a society was that its structure was a group of genea or hereditary tribes."[5] It was not only the artisan who was prevented from attempting to enter another calling but it appears that a member of any of the other lower classes as well was not allowed to follow any other occupation than that of his father. As a result, offices often remained in the same families for many generations. Thus we are told in the inscriptions that the office of architect continued in a certain family for twenty-three generations.[6] The goldsmith's art as well as that of the painter and the sculptor was traditionally handed down from father to son. As regards the three middle-class professions, viz. those of a priest, a scribe, and a warrior, though generally they ran in the same families, yet there was no restriction against any one following any of these callings, even if one's father might not have professed that particular calling but had carried on one of the other two. Nay, one and the same man, on suitable occasions, could be a priest, a military or naval commander or could act as a scribe and an official. "A general in the army could marry the daughter of a priest, and his children could be scribes, priests or public functionaries."[8] By the time of the early Ptolemies, however, and possibly earlier, only persons descended from priests could enter their profession. They had secured for the members of their class exemption from poll-tax.[9] Under the influence of their scribes, who were trying to exalt their own profession over the others, the Egyptians came to hold the agriculturists as well as the able craftsmen in light esteem.[10]

Among the Sumerians the aristocracy of the city was formed by the priests and the officials, while the free land-holding citizens formed the middle class, who worked their lands with the help of the slaves.[11] The fragments of Sumerian laws that have come down to us recognize no inequalities among these classes of the community.[12] But in the Code of Hammurabi, the nature and amounts of fines and punishments are mostly determined by the class-status of the offender and the sufferer.[13] The law of limb for limb was

restricted to those cases only where the sufferer belonged to the highest class, physical injuries in other cases being generally compensated for by fines. For a physical injury inflicted by a patrician on a plebeian the fine was one-third that which a plebeian would have had to pay if he had caused it to his equal. In the case of theft, the patrician paid thrice the fine that the plebeian had to pay. While divorcing a wife, for whom no bride-price was paid, the patricians had to pay her thrice the award that was demanded of a plebeian. The surgeon's fees depended on the status of the patient: the higher the status, the larger the fees.[14]

Woolley thinks that this class-system was military in its origin, and that was the reason why the lives of the patricians, who formed the regular army, were valued more than those of the non-combatant citizens.[15] This theory enables us to explain why in those cases where property was involved the higher classes had also greater responsibilities.

Whether all the males that were either descended from the same parents or were adopted in the family actually carried on the trade of the family is not quite clear. "Certainly many men who carried on a trade were 'sons' of the trade-father, but apparently not all."[16] And a clause in the code of Hammurapi lends support to the view that to enter into a particular trade, which was not followed by one's father, one had to seek legal adoption into a family that carried on that trade.[17] In some cities the trades had their distinct quarters.[18]

A slave could marry a free woman, the offspring being regarded as free. No disgrace seems to have attached to such a marriage, and such a free woman could bring with her a marriage-portion as if she had married in her own rank.[19]

In the earliest period of the Iranian civilization, i.e. before 700 B.C., three classes of society are often mentioned, priests, warriors, and husbandmen, but the fourth class,

formed by artisans, is only once mentioned, though there is frequent reference to the work carried on by members of this class, viz. goldsmith, blacksmith, mason, etc. The origin of these classes is attributed to Zarathushtra.[20] According to the Shah Namah, however, the four classes were made by Yima.[21] In the Sassanian period, A.D. 226-651, we get more frequent references to these classes, and their relative position is also more well-defined. The priests are likened to the head of man, the warriors to his hands, the husbandmen to his stomach, and the artisans to his feet. Further, we are told that the members of the last class engaged also in trade and commerce. The four classes were credited with different virtues, good nature being that of the premier class, resourcefulness and manliness of the second, strenuous tillage of the third, and diligence and skill of the fourth. It is further observed that "the work of the priest is of the highest merit, and the lowest in the scale of usefulness is the work of the fourth class, more particularly their work of trade and commerce."[22]

The profession of the priest seems to have been hereditary from the earliest times when the classes began to be recognized. By the Sassanian period it was held to be the natural order to follow the occupation of one's ancestors. And if anyone wanted to try a profession other than the one of his class, he was allowed to do so only if, on examination, he proved to be a man of marked talent.[23]

It was only in the late period of Iranian history that there came to be any impediments to intermarriage between the different classes of society, the priestly class arrogating to itself the right of marrying girls from the laity, though refusing to give theirs to the lay youths.[24] Intermarriage of a Zoroastrian with a non-Zoroastrian was condemned in strong terms.[25]

In China it is supposed that society has, from time immemorial, been divided into four orders, viz. gentlemen, agriculturists, artisans, and merchants. Gentlemen were all the

members of the governing class, the members of the civil service, admission to which depended on a literary test, open to almost all who would like to try their luck and intelligence. "No profession except that of serving the State entitles a man to be called a 'gentleman'." Banker, barrister, physician, priest, merchant-prince, manufacturer, engineer, none of these could be styled a gentleman on the strength of either his profession or wealth. "The sole cachet of aristocracy is literary attainment which has given its proofs."[26] There was a slightly lower grade division of this class which was formed by those who had qualified for the civil service and yet had to be on the waiting list for lack of suitable appointments. These were known as the scholars.[27] Next in order stood the workers of the soil, agriculture being regarded, from very early times, a very noble calling. The social ladder was not quite complete with the traders. There still remained the barbers and their sons who were reckoned among the pariah classes and were debarred from competing for the civil service.[28] According to Confucius, the people were divided into five classes, which in the descending order of social prestige were scholars, farmers, artisans, merchants, and servants, soldiers being always included in the last group.[29] In ancient times soldiers and scholars were grouped together under one term.[30]

Ranks were distinguished by different head-dresses, garments, badges, etc.[31] None whose parents were engaged in one of the degrading occupations, like menial service, play-acting or brothel-keeping, was allowed to compete for the civil service.[32] One of the emperors forbade the use of silk garments or carriages by merchants; and in order to render that calling unpopular he levied heavy taxes on them.[33]

Except the civil service, it appears that most of the other occupations were customarily hereditary. One of the Chinese books lays it down as a rule that "the sons of officers ought always to be officers, the sons of artisans ought always to be artisans. The sons of merchants ought always to be

merchants, and the sons of farmers ought always to be farmers".[34]

Marriages between officials and actresses or singing girls were not allowed. In the case of nobles of hereditary rank entering into such a union the penalty was degradation to a lower class.[35] Play-actors, policemen, and boatmen had to marry women of their own class. No slave could marry a free woman.[36] Officials were included under the scholar class and were loath to intermarry with merchant families. "Chinese society has been characterized by a remarkable minimum of hard and fast class divisions", observes Latourette.[37]

In Japan during her military age—twelfth century to the middle of the nineteenth century A.D.—society was divided into five distinct groups. Hereditary soldiers, the Samurai, were the foremost of these. Farmers, artisans, and traders followed next in order. The fifth class was formed by two groups called the Eta and the Hinin, who were the Pariahs and outcasts of the community.[38] Every occupation that brought a man into contact with unclean things, such as the corpses of human beings, the carcasses of animals, and offal of all descriptions, was degraded.[39] Occupations that catered for the sensuous side of man as well as those that did not carry a fixed scale of remuneration were regarded as low.[40] The degrading callings, and some others like stone-cutting and casting of metal, were relegated to the outcasts.[41] After the Revolution a change was brought about in the social classification and at the present day (1930) there are three classes established by law. These are the nobility, the gentry, and the common people who include farmers, artisans, and merchants. The first two classes constitute only five per cent of the population, the rest being commoners. Every householder is required to nail up over his door a ticket with his name and class inscribed thereon.[42]

During the eight centuries of military feudalism preceding the Revolution the Samurai was a being apart. His con-

duct was governed by special canons, and special tribunals judged his offences. If he was temporarily imprisoned and had to be presented at a court, he was carried in a closed sedan-chair, while a common prisoner was marched through the streets.

The tribunal that adjudicated on matters relating to temples and shrines was distinct from that which had jurisdiction in the case of artisans, merchants, and others, and the agriculturists. During the latter part of the seventeenth century separate jails were built: one for the Samurai and priests, another for the merchants and common people and a third for the farmers. Till the latter part of the seventeenth century it had not been usual to send a Samurai to gaol for any crime.[43] The Eta had to live on the outskirts of towns and villages and were governed by their own headmen. Prejudice against this unfortunate class of people was so great that it long survived the removal of their legal disabilities in 1871, serving as a theme for novelists.[44]

The outcastes could not marry persons of the higher classes.[45] During the feudal age intermarriage among the various recognized classes of society required special permission.[46]

In Mexico, as a result of its conquest by the Europeans, the population is divided into three main well-marked groups with numerous sub-divisions. The highest class is formed of members who have a more or less pure Spanish descent, the half-breed coming next, and the pure Indians forming the lowest class.[47] When the Spaniards captured Mexico they found that the sons generally learned the trades and entered the professions of their fathers. "The different trades were arranged into something like guilds, having each a particular district of the city appropriated to it, with its own chief, its own tutelary deity, its peculiar festivals."[48]

In spite of the great cultural differences, mixture of the Spaniards and the Indians has proceeded apace, largely it

would appear because of the half-breed, called mestizo, being more active and adaptable than the Indian. In 1921 the pure Whites formed only 19% of the total population pure Indians 38% and the mestizo 43%. According to a calculation made about 1940 the respective percentages had changed to 17, 29 and 54. The half-breed is almost invariably the result of the mating of a Spanish male with an Indian female. It is interesting to note that the White man though very properly was called *español* yet was otherwise known as *gachupin,* 'one who wears shoes'. In Peru too, where the Spaniards mixed with the Indians, the half-breeds, known as mestizo, have been on the increase. The half-breeds, living on the coastline, have special terms for all degrees of colour and race.

In Brazil, where the native Indians are not known to have developed a pre-Columbus civilization, and which was colonized by the Portuguese, the latter are described to have given the country "its language and basic racial type." The first half-breeds, known as mestizo or mameluco, were the progeny as elsewhere of the White male and the Indian female. Later the Negroes were introduced. Intermarriage was not forbidden. Today* with Brazil's population standing at little over 40 millions, the pure Indians and the mestizo form only 2 and 18 per cent of the population. The Whites are about three times the Negroes, among whom too the half-breed, called mulatto, shows greater growth. It is the old families of Portuguese descent that form the aristocracy, and being wealthy they have not allowed themselves to be superseded by the new rich from among the mixed population. "Exclusiveness is something unknown in Brazil, and in both the racial and social spheres, the process of assimilation continues" observes Zweig. In view of the figures given above this assimilation does not appear to be much different from annihilation of the Indian. In real assimilation one expects the half-breed to grow in preponderance.[49]

* This was written in 1950.

Among the Kayans and Kenyaks of Borneo there are three classes, the upper, middle and the slaves.[50] The Maoris distinguish the following orders in their society: the sacerdotal chiefs of smaller tribal divisions, the skilled artisans and other professionals, the bulk of the comparatively poor population and lastly the slaves taken captive in war.[51] The Samoans recognize six classes: The chiefs, priests, landed gentry, large landowners, commoners, and slaves, the first not being wholly uniform.[52] But the most distinct and unbridgeable gulf lies between the patricians and the plebeians—the two main divisions of society comprising the above classes.[53] Tahitian society was divided into classes that were insuperably distinct from one another. The privileged class was composed of the reigning king, the chieftains, and their relations. Next in rank came the gentry, the farmers, artisans and fishermen forming the next class. The lowest class comprised servants and slaves.[54] Among the Hawaiians, society was marked by an exclusive class-division, all persons belonging by birth to one of the three classes. The *ariis* or the nobles, the *hakuaina* or land-proprietors and the priests, the *canakamowree* or the common people, comprising the small farmers, artisans and professionals, fishermen and labourers.[55]

In some parts of Fiji the people are divided into small independent bodies with smaller groups within each, these latter being called Matanggali. In some cases the Matanggali of a tribe have different functions, and some of these groups among the ordinary people are differentiated by the possession of special occupations.[56]

The people of Borneo nearly always marry within their class, though persons of the middle class sometimes do marry females of the slave class.[57] In the Carolinas, apart from the slaves, there are two classes, the lower of which is forbidden to touch the higher on pain of death. Further they are not allowed to carry on fishing and seafaring, nor to marry with members of the higher class.[58] Africa provides us with a very interesting case of obligatory endogamy. The smiths often form a social group kept distinct from the rest of the

community, to which they belong, by having to marry within their group.[59] Though totemism is generally associated with exogamy yet there are totemic groups both in Africa and elsewhere that are more or less endogamous.[60]

In South Arabia there are two classes of Pariahs. One class, comprising the artisans, was regarded as the subordinate menials of the dominant class. Its members were required to live on the outskirts of the towns, and though admitted into the mosques were not allowed to visit Arab houses. The other class of Pariahs was regarded as still inferior, and its members were not allowed to enter even the mosque, though they were devout Muslims.[61]

There is enough evidence to show that the Arabs had no law of endogamy. But they did not like to intermarry with people who had different tastes and customs.[62]

In ancient Rome the populace was for a long time divided into three groups—the patricians, the plebeians, and the slaves. Of these the first two classes comprised all the free men. It is a matter of common knowledge that the evolution of political institutions in Rome was largely the result of a conflict between the patricians, the politically privileged class, and the plebeians who were politically insignificant. Up to the time of Servius Tullius the patricians alone ranked as citizens. Their marriage was regarded as sanctified and lawful. They had the special powers of testamentary disposition. None but they could consult the gods of Rome by a specially sacred procedure.[63] The plebeians were the artisans and craftsmen of Rome. Their marriages were not celebrated with the religious ceremony to which the patricians were accustomed, and were looked upon by the latter as not involving the legal consequences of marriage.[64] The disparity between the class and the mass in their political as well as socio-religious rights was gradually removed, so that by 287 B.C. the two groups were placed on a footing of equality.[65] Yet the old spirit found new embodiment in social matters. The great economic development resulting in many new and varied occupations fostered some

which came to be looked upon as degraded *ipso facto*.[66] The development of economic life had advanced so far that even specialized arts and crafts had formed guilds. Thus the shoe-makers had amongst them various divisions like boot-makers, sandal-makers, slipper-makers, and ladies' shoe-makers. Workers in the same craft and trade congregated at Rome and elsewhere in Italy in special districts. There was a guild of any thing and every thing, each with its special deity and an annual festival. In the annual procession of the patron deity the guildsmen marched through the streets with their regalia and flag.[67] Roman laws of the fifth century of the Christian era reveal the upper class as cut off from the masses. Every social grade and occupation was "practically hereditary, from the senator to the waterman on the Tiber, or the sentinel at a frontier post." There was a tendency to stereotype social life by preventing free circulation among different callings and grades in society.[68] The Theodosian Code compelled a youth to follow the employment of his father.[69]

In prehistoric Rome endogamy existed to this extent that marriage was arranged within the limits of the gens.[70] Generally marriage could take place only between parties that were equal in their political rights. Thus a free man could not wed a freed woman without the special permission of the Senate.[71] A man of the senatorial rank could not contract a marriage with a woman born in one of the degraded occupations.[72] In the fifth century A.D. men were not permitted to marry out of their guild. If the daughter of a member of the baker caste married a man not belonging to it, her husband had to adopt her father's calling.[73] These provisions about marriage and occupation were more in the nature of financial adjustments than social development.

The Celts occupied Ireland in the 4th century B.C. and soon supplanted the aboriginal Pictish speech and culture. Prof. Macalister is convinced from his study of both the literary and archaeological remains of the immediately succeeding ages, that there was a marked contrast in the physical make-up and appearance between the new-comers and the aborigines.

He finds that in the literature of the period "every person spoken of with respect" is described as tall and fair, while "every person who for any reason is spoken of with disdain is described as being short, dark, and with close-cropped hair." He concludes from this that the physical contrast was "maintained by restrictions on intermarriage."[74]

In Anglo-Saxon England society was divided into three well-marked classes of people: the nobleman, the common freeman, and the slaves. There seems to have been also a fourth class called the "Laet". It represented a class "intermediate between freemen and slaves, which was rather infrequent in England though very common among the Teutonic peoples of the Continent".[75] This class, which was a feature peculiar to Kentish society, seems to have had three sub-divisions differing in their wergelds, with wergelds of 80, 60, and 40 shillings respectively.[76] The first class had two divisions, a higher and a lower order, the higher order, whose immediate overlord was the king, being subject to higher charges and heavier fines. The membership of the class was partly inherited and partly acquired. Possession of a certain amount of land by a family continuously for three generations bestowed permanent nobility on the members of that family.[77] The second class comprised all the free persons of English blood who were not members of the first class. Though there were many sub-divisions in this class we find no evidence of any difference in wergeld,[78] "the fixed sum with which a person's death must be atoned for to his kindred or which he might in some cases have to pay for his own misdoing." The nobleman's wergeld was six times that of a commoner's; and his oath also was worth as much.[79] The slave being unfree was not a legal person and as such had no wergeld.

The clergy seem to have been regarded as members of the nobility; yet there was a special scale of wergeld for them. A priest, who was a nobleman previous to his taking orders, could have the option of demanding either the wergeld that was proper to his original rank or one that was due to him

because of his ecclesiastical rank.[80]

If a slave stole the property of a freeman he had to pay twice the amount as compensation, while if the theft was committed by a freeman he paid thrice. If it was the priest's property that was stolen ninefold compensation had to be paid.[81] If a man's servant killed a nobleman, whose wergeld was three hundred shillings, the owner had to surrender the servant and pay the price of three men; but if he killed a commoner, whose wergeld was only a hundred shillings, then the owner paid the price of only one man in addition to surrendering the homicide. If a priest killed a man—any freeman—he was ejected from the monastic order and his property confiscated.[82] Fornication with a nobleman's serving maid was to be compensated for by double the sum of money that had to be paid in the case of the same offence being committed in respect of the serving maid of a commoner. If a man committed adultery with the wife of a servant, he had to pay compensation, while if he did the same with the wife of a freeman he had to procure a second wife in addition to compensation. If a betrothed woman of the commoner class was guilty of fornication, she was ordered to pay 60 shillings as compensation to the surety of the marriage; if she belonged to the higher class, this amount was to be greater in proportion to her wergeld. "If anyone rapes the slave of a commoner, he shall pay 5 shillings to the commoner, and a fine of 60 shillings. If a slave rapes a slave, castration shall be required as compensation." For illicit union a nobleman had to pay double the commoner's compensation.[83] Breaking into the premises of a nobleman had to be atoned for by thrice or six times the fine that had to be paid for the same offence against a commoner. In the scale of compensation that a man had to pay for fighting in the house of another the same proportion had to be maintained between the two classes.[84] A priest could clear himself of any charge by a simple declaration; a clerk had to place his hand on the altar accompanied by three men of his class, while a commoner was required to clear himself by the collective oath of himself and three of his own class.[85] "If a nobleman who holds land neglects military service, he

shall pay 120 shillings and forfeit his land; a nobleman who holds no land shall pay 60 shillings; a commoner shall pay a fine of 30 shillings for neglecting military service."[86]

By the thirteenth century the law of status had become relatively insignificant, and the law of tenure had risen into prominence. Accordingly, the lawbooks have very little to say about the ranks of men and a great deal about tenures. "In the main all free men are equal before the law. Just because this is so, the line between the free and the unfree seems very sharp." And even this distinction is very apt to appear in practice as a difference in tenures. The clergy was gaining in importance. Every ordained clerk was subject to special rules of ecclesiastical and secular law. If he committed any of the crimes known as felonies, he could be tried only by an ecclesiastical court. A layman assaulting a clerk had to submit to a trial by the ecclesiastical as well as by the temporal tribunals.[87]

By the fifteenth century commercial spirit had grown so much that the dwindling ideas of status had come to be replaced by social distinctions based on the possession of wealth, even land being regarded as a mere manifestation and a source of wealth. The failure of the sumptuary laws of this period is a measure of the futility of keeping the old class division.[88]

In Scandinavia during the early Middle Ages the following scheme of social classes was in force: highborn men comprising the kingly families and their immediate liegemen; the nobles; the great landed middle class, including all grades of free-holders; freed men and their descendants of many generations; and slaves. It was possible for members of lower rank to rise to the superior grade both by marriage as well as by accumulation of wealth. Yet the social stratification made its mark on social etiquette, and legal and sacerdotal affairs. Thus, in the great banqueting halls seats were so arranged that the lowliest members might be accommodated nearest the door. "Class discrimination was, however, felt most in connection with legal

and governmental matters, in determining the amount of wergeld which must be paid if a member of the population was wronged or killed, in the composition of the juries, and in the exercise of legislative and judicial power at the political assemblies." In the public cemetries of the Christian church the nobles were buried in the most sacred ground, nearest to the church, while the other classes had their burying places at further distances in the descending order of their rank, the slaves being relegated to the ground nearest the wall of the churchyard.[89]

During mediaeval times all over Europe trades and crafts were highly organized. There was a certain lack of freedom, therefore, about the choice of a trade or a craft. Thus in England, where smithcraft was held in special esteem, no villein was allowed to carry on that craft without his lord's permission.[90] When the important crafts came to be organized into guilds, anyone who desired to practise a particular craft had to join the guild as a journeyman to take his training in that craft. At first, it seems admission was unrestricted and the conditions fairly light, thus making the guilds more or less free associations of persons, engaged in crafts and pledged to instructing the new generation in the means of getting their livelihood. But in later times, about the thirteenth century, they degenerated into family coteries. The widow of a guildsman might carry on the trade of her husband, or could confer the freedom of the guild on her second husband if he was following the same trade. But if she married a man not belonging to the same craft, not only could she not confer the freedom of the guild on her new husband but she herself was excluded from the guild. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the restrictions on admission to a craft guild became more and more rigorous, and the handicrafts became practically the monopolies of a few families.

About the same time in Germany a candidate for admission into a guild had to furnish proofs of pure birth in order to be worthy of such admission. Whole classes of people were being excluded from the guilds on the pretence of some

infamy attaching to their birth, so much so that, after the sixteenth century, legislation had to be passed to remedy this growing evil. Apprentices, who proved the purity of their birth, had to undergo heavy expenses and during their probation had to undertake long travel, extending over as many as five years, before they could set up as masters of their crafts. Further, before a craftsman could set up independent practice, he had to prepare a masterpiece, which generally was a very costly and a useless article. The sons of master-craftsmen were, on the other hand, free from all these prohibitive conditions. In effect the guilds became clubs of families, hereditarily carrying on the particular crafts.

"The punishments decreed by the craft-guilds consisted in the payment of fines, or in earlier times in certain quantities of wax, or of beer or wine to be drunk at their feasts." Offences like forgery led to exclusion from the guild and withdrawal of the right to practise the craft.[91] The members of each craft usually occupied the same locality. Thus in London, the weavers concentrated in Cannon Steet, smiths in Smithfield, and so on. "Such a grouping must have enormously strengthened the sense of corporate life in each craft."[92]

Though the crafts, the practice of which was from very early times hedged in by many restrictions, had become more or less hereditary, the learned professions and commerce had begun to offer fresh fields for the intelligent youths. "The church had always provided clever youths with an opportunity of rising in the world." Towards the end of the fourteenth and throughout the following century, it seems, the clergy were largely recruited from the middle classes and even from serfs, the economic changes rendering the profession less attractive to the members of the upper classes. In the fifteenth century the legal profession also opened up possibilities of a brilliant career.[93]

In the cities of Europe guilds were ranked according to the recognized importance of their trades. The principle on which the occupations were rated was evidently not the vital

importance of the needs which were supplied by them. "The status of a profession seems to have depended on whether it was more or less honourable, lucrative or ancient. The place of honour was reserved for those crafts in which brain-work took precedence over manual work. They were regarded as honourable, evidently because in the dualistic conception which governed Christian societies, spirit was placed above matter, the intellectual above the animal part of man." The occupations demanding intellectual work alone came to be designated "liberal" professions, as contrasted with those involving manual labour, these latter being termed "servile". In the university towns the professors occupied the first rank and shared with the nobles the privilege of walking on the wall side of the pavement. The doctors also belonged to this category, though their brethren of lower origins, the surgeon-barbers, were relegated to a lower status on account of their partiality for surgical operations. Though craftsmen usually were rated low, the goldsmiths had secured a high rank. Dealers in articles that were to be brought from distant countries, like spices and furs, were ranked very high. Bankers, moneychangers, and wholesale dealers were distinguished not only because their professions required quickness of perception, complicated calculations, wide range of vision and rare thought, but also because of their show of wealth. "It is easy to see that in the priority accorded to the great industrial and commercial guilds, the second of the principles we have mentioned was at work, namely, that a craft was considered more or less honourable according to the wealth it yielded. . . . It was undoubtedly for this reason that the butchers, who had numerous assistants working under their orders and who made considerable profit, sometimes managed in Paris to be included among the 'Six Guilds'." Home crafts suffered from internal competition and thus were ranked rather low. At Florence the baker and the bread-maker came last in the list of the twenty-one official guilds.[94]

It was in keeping with these ideas of occupational dignity that in France a member of the nobility had his noble state suspended if he carried on trade or handicraft, incompatible

with the profession of arms.[95]

The laws of the Anglo-Saxons laid it down that none was to seek in marriage a mate outside one's class, so that if a person of lower status married a woman of a higher class he was to perish.[96] By the fifteenth century in England this rule of endogamy had almost vanished, so much so that one of the usual methods by which the needy nobles replenished their empty purses was by marrying the daughters or widows of rich merchants. Such marriages went a long way in fusing the upper and the middle classes.[97] In France, in the later period of the Roman Empire, the workmen, employed in the manufactures of the State like that of arms, were not allowed to marry their daughters outside their group.[98] In the eyes of the tribal law the only legal marriage that could take place was between free-born people of equal status. The free woman who married her own slave lost her freedom, and had her property confiscated, and the slave was killed on the wheel. Where a free man married either his slave or a freed woman, neither the wife nor the issue of the union attained the rank of the man.[99] During the feudal age, however, legitimate children took the status of their father, the principle that gentility came from the father being gradually recognized. If a free woman married a nobleman she attained his status but not so a servile woman.[100] In Germany "the consequences of equality of birth in private law made themselves felt in the law of family and inheritance. Only an equal-born member of the estate had the right of exercising guardianship over minors and women. And only between those equal in birth was there a right of inheritance". Originally members of different status-groups could not contract a legal marriage. A free woman's marriage with a slave meant loss of freedom to the woman or of life to the slave. Under the influence of Christianity the rigour of laws against the unequal marriages was much lessened, such unions being regarded as only inferior marriages and the issue as quite legitimate. But the higher status of one of the parties could not be conferred on the other, the issue being naturally relegated to the status of the lower-born. Exceptionally the children of a union, where the

wife was a free woman and the husband half-free or unfree, were allowed to inherit the natural freedom of their mother. In the newer grouping of society on the occupational basis "the principle of equal birth was less and less heeded." Only the higher nobility has still clung to it.[101]

To sum up, distinction by birth has been usually recognized by many primitive peoples and almost all the major civilizations of ancient times. The primitive peoples, in so far as their arts and crafts are neither many, nor highly specialized, have few classes whose status is fixed. But wherever status is recognized, privileges and restrictions in the matter of the choice of avocation are very common. Restriction on the choice of one's mate based on birth is comparatively infrequent among them. In tribal England, in Rome, and in Asian civilizations, occupations not only tended to become hereditary but were actually prescribed to be followed by specific classes and graded in certain order as high and low. Specialized occupations had come to form themselves into units of community life. Society was divided into two, three, four, or five well-marked status-groups, intermarriage between which was often prohibited. The Chinese civilization, before it was influenced by Indian ideas, seems to have been the most free in its social grouping.

Well-marked status-groups within a society, distinguished from one another by rights and disabilities, separated from one another by the absence of freedom of intermarriage, may, therefore, be considered to be a common characteristic of the mental background and social picture of the Indo-European cultures. Specialization of occupations, accompanied by solidarity within specified occupations and great unfreedom about their choice, was a feature common to the ancient and mediaeval times. The circumstances that led to the abolition of distinctions, based on birth and occupation, in Rome and in England are peculiar to each and cannot be gone into here. Suffice it for us to remember that in each case it was the special conditions, making for political unity and commercial aggrandisement, that slowly killed the ideas of status by birth

and removed the unfreedom of occupation. G. M. Trevelyan's observation about Chaucer's England illustrates the point. Trevelyan remarks: "National self-consciousness is beginning to dissolve the local loyalties and the rigid class divisions which had characterized the cosmopolitan society of the feudal age."[102]

1. Breasted, (2), p. 67.
2. Breasted, (1), p. 246.
3. Maspero, p. 350.
4. Breasted, (1), p. 247.
5. Petrie, pp. 11-12.
6. Spencer, iii, p. 422.
7. Erman, p. 460.
8. Wilkinson, i, p. 159, a note by Dr. S. Birch.
9. A. M. Blackman, in *Ency. of R. and E.*, vol. x, p. 299 (b).
10. Erman, p. 446, Breasted, (1), p. 169.
11. Breasted, (2), p. 119.
12. Brooks, p. 88.
13. Jastrow, p. 293.
14. Johns, p. 74, and pp. 44-63 of *The Code of Hammurapi* edited by him.
15. Woolley, p. 97.
16. Johns, p. 121.
17. Brooks, p. 44.
18. Johns, p. 121.
19. Ibid., pp. 75, 136.
20. Dhalla, p. 65.
21. Ibid., p. 7.
22. Ibid., p. 295.
23. Ibid., p. 296.
24. Ibid., p. 78.
25. Ibid., p. 304.
26 Brinkley, xi, pp. 202-4
27. Douglas, p. 116.
28. Ibid., pp. 120-46.
29. Bashford, p. 43.
30. Latourette, II, p. 206.
31. Werner (1), Table I.
32. Brinkley xi, pp. 208-9.
33. Brinkley. x, p. 132.
34. Spencer, iii, p. 422.
35. Möllendorff, p. 20.
36. Werner (2), p. 40.
37. Op. cit., II. pp. 204-206.
38. Longford, pp. 69-70.

39. Brinkley (2), vol. ii, p. 41.
40. Ibid.
41. Ibid., p. 49.
42. Chamberlain, p. 95
43. Brinkley, iv, pp. 64-6, 76.
44. Chamberlain, pp. 149-50.
45. Brinkley (2), vol. ii, p. 50.
46. *Ency. of R. and E.*, viii, p. 459 (b).
47. Spencer, p. 25.
48. Spencer, vol. iii, pp. 422-45.
49. *E.B.*, XVI, pp. 381-382; XVII, p. 628; Zweig, pp. 136-7, 149. 150, 155. *E.B.*, IV, pp. 50-51; *Conditions of Life & Work of Indigenous Populations of Latin American Countries* (I.L.O. Publication, 1949), p. 17.
50. Hose and McDougall, i, p. 68.
51. Lowie, pp. 346-7.
52. Ibid., p. 347.
53. Ibid., p. 349.
54. Featherman, ii b, p. 37.
55. Ibid., p. 244.
56. Rivers, pp. 264-5. N.B.: The account of the Fijian and the Samoan classes given by A. M. Hocart makes it quite clear that these systems are copied from the Hindu caste system. See the summary appearing in *Nature*, 7th April, 1928, p. 551.
57. Hose and McDougall, pp. 71-2.
58. Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution*, (1916), p. 274, f.n. 5.
59. Rivers in *Ency. of R. and E.* viii, p. 424 (b).
60. *E.B.* XXII, p. 315.
61. Featherman, v, p. 424.
62. Smith, W. Robertson, pp. 74-5, and f.n. 2.
63. Muirhead, p. 6.
64. Ibid., pp. 11-12; Louis, pp. 48-9.
65. Leage, p. 14.
66. Tucker, p. 295.
67. Friedländer, vol. i, p. 147; Tucker, p. 254; Dill (2), p. 265.
68. Dill, (2), pp. 228-33.
69. Lambert, p. 12.
70. Warde Fowler, in *Ency. of R. and E.*, viii, p 463 (a); cf. Ghurye (2), pp. 210-11.
71. Leffingwell, p. 39.
72. Tucker, p. 295.
73. Dill, (2), p. 233; Louis, p. 261.
74. *E.B.* XII, p. 618.
75. Attenborough, p. 177.
76. Chadwick, p. 112.
77. Ibid., pp. 79-84.

78. Ibid., p. 85.
79. Pollock and Maitland, p. 33.
80. Ibid., p. 34
81. Attenborough, pp. 5, 17.
82. Ibid., pp. 19-75.
83. Ibid., pp. 7, 9, 15, 25, 73, 75
84. Ibid., pp. 81-3.
85. Ibid., p. 29.
86. Ibid., p. 53.
87. Pollock and Maitland, pp. 407, 412, 439, 441.
88. Abram, p. 72.
89. Williams, pp. 35-6.
90. Traill, vol. i, p. 104.
91. Toulmin Smith (Lujo Brentano in), pp. cxxvi-vii, cxxxii, cxlix-cli; Huebner, pp. 104, 129.
92. Ashley, p. 96.
93. Abram, pp. 99, 106.
94. Renard, pp. 57-61.
95. Brissaud (2), p. 300.
96. N. K. Sidhanta, *The Heroic Age of India*, pp. 136-7.
97. Abram, p. 89. N.B.: Compare the practice of the Japanese Samurai, in the middle of the eighteenth century, of adopting into their families the sons of rich commoners to replenish their treasury: Yosoburo Takakoshi, *The Economic Aspects of the History of the Civilization of Japan*, (1930), vol. ii, pp. 452-3.
98. Brissaud (2), p. 48.
99. Brissaud (1), pp. 158-9.
100. Brissaud (2), pp. 291, f.n. 6, 298.
101. Huebner, pp. 92-4, 99.
102. Op. cit., p. 3.

7

Origins Of Caste-System

Social differentiation with its attendant demarcation of groups and of status of individuals is a very widespread feature of human society.[1] In by far the larger number of communities this status depends on the individual's achievement in those fields of activity which are prized by those communities. They range from capacity for certain types of supernatural experience to ability to acquire wealth. The visible marks of this differentiation are, as we have seen, special rights for some groups and disabilities on others in the matter of dress, occupation, and even food. In other communities the status of an individual is determined by birth. People, speaking Indo-European tongues, carried this theory of status by birth to a farther extent than any other peoples, both in the matter of the number of differentiated groups within a society as well as in the matter of their rights and disabilities. Some of them even enjoined that members of a group shall marry in their own group. Thus it would be seen that the Hindu system is unique only in this that it alone classified some groups as untouchable and unapproachable.[2] In other respects it only differs in the thoroughness with which the scheme is worked out and in the number of differentiated groups.

Of the many cultures that flourished in India the literary records of the Indo-Aryan culture are not only the earliest but contain the first mention and a continuous history of the factors that make up caste. The only other culture whose records are intelligible is the Dravidian; but when that culture put forward its documents that are extant, it had already been immensely influenced by the Indo-Aryan tradition. The brahmanic variety of this Indo-Aryan civilization—it is the most widely and deeply spread aspect—was developed in the Gangetic plain. I therefore conclude that some of the import-

ant aspects of caste originated in this region. The people, who are known here and elsewhere as Indo-Aryans and whose earliest literary records have furnished us with information about the institution of caste and class, belong linguistically to the larger family of peoples designated either as Indo-Europeans or as Indo-Germans. They comprised the Celts, the Anglo-Saxons and the Teutons, the Romans, and the Iranians among others. The Spanish and the Portuguese too belong to the same family. In prehistoric times about 5,000 B.C., the ancestors of all these peoples seem to have occupied one fairly defined region and to have been in close cultural contact with one another. When for some reason they dispersed from their centre of characterization, various groups started in different directions and had varying adventures. Their separate languages diverged yet retained sufficint common structure and content to enable the 19th and 20th century philologists to group them together and reconstruct the primitive speech which must have been the stock-in-trade of their ancestors in their centre of characterization. One of the branches of these peoples which reached India about 2,500 B.C. with the kind of religion represented in the early Vedic religion is called the Indo-Aryans.

As shown above their favourite word for certain groups and orders of people was 'varṇa', 'colour'. Thus they spoke of the 'Dāsa varṇa', 'Dāsa colour' or more properly the Dāsa people. Iranian literature, though in the bulk very much later than the Vedas, has preserved the significant information that the Iranians spoke of the people, whom they found in occupation of certain areas which later they captured, as 'Dāha'. Iranian 'Dāha' is the exact equivalent of Vedic 'Dāsa', making allowance for the linguistic values of the sounds of the last syllable. Like the Vedic Aryans they spoke of themselves as 'Ārya' or 'Airya' whose identity with the Sanskrit word 'Ārya' need not be pointed out. The 'Dāha' are the predatory tribes of Turan, where before their bifurcation and further dispersal the ancestors of the Vedic Indians and Iranians lived together as one community, designating themselves by the term *Arya*. Though 'Dāha' means enemies or robbers, their

nationality is suspected to be Iranian. The Vedic Indians might well have applied the term to their enemies in India, the native population of the Panjab. It is further to be noted that though Iranian literature, perhaps because of its highly mutilated condition in which it has reached us, does not attest the use of the equivalent of the Sanskrit 'Anārya', 'un-Aryan', applied to a people, the Greek geographers like Strabo have mentioned a people called 'Anariacae', 'Non-Arians'.[3]

The early Persians and their great monarchs show a catholicity and pliability which is not merely a diplomatic gesture of a world empire. As the great historian Eduard Meyer has observed: "In contrast with Judaism, Zoroastrianism did not enter the lists against all gods save its own, but found no difficulty in recognizing them as subordinate powers —helpers and servants of Ahura-mazda." Darius, the Great, not only encouraged the efforts of the Egyptian priests in every way, but also built temples for their gods. Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes I between them enabled the Jews to re-establish themselves in Babylon. This spirit of tolerance and even of active sympathy and of selective assimilation of the early Persians stands in marked contrast with the exclusiveness and intolerance of their successors in the Sassanian period about 700 to 800 years later. The Neo-Persian empire, as the Sassanian kingdom is designated, showed itself to be a continuation of the national tradition of the Achaemenian period in almost all respects, excepting in that of the basic spirit of tolerance and of the practice of ceremonial purity. Something had happened to the Persians during this long interval. Prescriptions of ceremonial purity which could not be observed abroad were being diligently adhered to. In the words of Eduard Meyer, "the ritual and the doctrine of purity were elaborated and expanded, and there was evolved a complete and detailed system of casuistry, dealing with all things allowed and forbidden, the forms of pollution and the expiation for each, etc., which in its arid and spiritless monotony, vividly recalls the similar prescriptions in the Pentateuch. . . . In, short, the tolerance of the Achaemenids and the indifference of the Arsacids are now

replaced by intolerance and religious persecution."[4] These words of this savant and others too many to be quoted here, are very significant for a student of the development of the idea of ceremonial purity and its role in the growth of exclusiveness which are so fundamental in the Indian caste-society. And it cannot be a mere coincidence that, as we have seen, the four social orders of the Persian society, viz. the Athravan etc., are positively enumerated and the few privileges and disabilities pertaining to them are specifically mentioned during the Sassanian period of Persian history. The Indian Aryans, as must have been plain from a perusal of chapter III, began with moderate amount of both exclusiveness and tolerance. Having come across people, who were very dark in colour and had rather snub noses, they described the earlier settlers as 'dark colour', as people without noses, and applied to them the term 'dāsa' which in Iranian stood for 'enemy'. Their ideas of ritual purity, which we have come across in the fourth chapter, are very much earlier in extant available literature. They are quite analogous too. In matters of religious faith and practice, though they began by stigmatizing that of the natives, they did not develop the extreme intolerance which the Persians of the Sassanian period show. Their tolerance of the varied faiths was based on the principle that religious and moral belief and practice were to be adjusted to the spiritual stature of individuals and groups. The Indian Aryans as later Hindus not only tolerated both beliefs and practices not harmonizing with their central doctrines but also assimilated a number in their own complex. Partially at least on the social organizational side caste system was the *modus operandi* accommodating diversity of faiths and practices.

Limited and conditional exclusiveness and consequent practice of ceremonial purity show themselves as fundamental traits of culture and character of other and western branches of Indo-European peoples. The Greeks, even in the heyday of their philosophical thought, manifested this spirit. Their contempt of the slaves is almost proverbial; and the bulk of the slave-population differed from them in both race and

culture. Plato, the maker of ideal laws, offers the finest testimony of the depth of this feeling and perhaps of the extent of the practice. His penalty for the heinous offence of striking one's parent is the perpetual exilement of the striker from the city. In order that his exile and ostracism may be completely successful, Plato further lays down a rule, which is redolent of the caste penalties of the Hindus on their erring members. It runs: "And if any person eat or drink, or have any other sort of intercourse with him, or only meeting him have voluntarily touched him, he shall not enter into any temple, nor into the agora, nor into the city, until he is purified; for he should consider that he has become tainted by a curse."[5]

Just as the Vedic Aryans came across, in India, a civilized people, those perhaps who have left the traces of their culture in the mounds at Harappa in the Panjab and at Mohenjodaro in Sindh, the Greeks were confronted in their land of choice with the higher Aegean civilization. The interaction of the two cultures and its results are not adequately preserved for us. Some eight or ten centuries after the Greeks were face to face and in close contact with another civilization of much greater antiquity, stability and width, when they established a colony at Naukratis in Egypt. Some intelligible account of what happened then is available. It is very illuminating and may be presented here with advantage. It is well known that after Alexander's death when his vast empire was parcelled out among the various claimants Egypt fell to the lot of Ptolemy. The social history of Ptolemaic Egypt in general and that of the cities like Naukratis and the newer Alexandria is instructive. Pride and exclusive spirit, which are so patent in the early Vedic literature, were exhibited by the Greeks even in their dealings with the Egyptians, from whose stable and old civilization their own had already received not only inspiration in general but a few specific traits too. They treated the Egyptians as a subject people, being themselves the conquerors. In spite of their appreciation of the high antiquity of the civilization of the Egyptians they showed themselves as the heirs and representatives of a higher one. One may well compare this situation with that prevailing in India during

the better part of the 19th century, the British taking the place of the Greeks and the Indians that of the Egyptians. In the cities of Alexandria, Naukratis etc., they seem to have segregated the populations. And marriages between them were not permitted. Even Greek males could not marry Egyptian females. But in the country, where there was no such bar, the Greek and Macedonian soldiers and ordinary settlers had no horror of intermarriage with Egyptian women. The Egypatians on their part had realized that in order to get on with the victors and rulers it was necessary for them not only to learn Greek but also to dress and behave like the Greeks. From this double process ensued a fairly continual mixture of blood. The racial difference too began to grow less and less, so that large numbers of people in Egypt, who later on called themselves Greeks were in reality mainly Egyptian in blood, refined or diluted by a slight admixture of the blood from Greek males. The distinction between the higher stratum of Greeks and the lower stratum of Egyptians did not cease. Yet if the Ptolemaic rule had continued longer and had not been cut short by the incursion of the proud Romans, the difference between the Greek and the Egyptian might have gradually faded away. Edwyn Bevan[6] who opines thus also informs his readers that the rule of the Romans further depressed the condition of the Egyptians, who thenceforward came third in rank and thus almost represented the castaway.

The impact between the Vedic Indians and the earlier settlers of India represents a situation only slightly different from that of the Greco-Egyptian one. First of all, it appears that the people of India who opposed the Vedic Aryans were preponderantly of dark colour. Second, however high the local civilization might have been the Indian Aryans had not derived theirs from the local variety. The Vedic people had thus much gerater reason to show off their pride and exclusiveness. As we have seen in the third chapter they used rather strong expressions against the natives and though they did not mind using their women for sex-gratification they had a great prejudice against marrying them. An Aryan

woman demeaning herself by consorting with a native male was simply an anathema and as such a situation vehemently deprecated.

The doings of another branch of the Indo-Europeans, the Romans, seem to present a parallel in some respects to the Indian development of caste. And I have already drawn my readers' attention to these common elements. But the occupational endogamy and restrictions were largely an imposition during the period when fiscal arrangements required a steady flow of occupational activity and the social conditions and trends conspired to hinder it. If we therefore leave this apparent similarity engendered in the last period of the Roman Empire we shall find the social history of Rome helping us to understand the Indian development rather by contrast than by similarity. The Romans and the Greeks were peculiar among peoples of antiquity in having been almost completely free from priestly power.[7]

First, the small number of original Romans seem to have been divided into two classes, the patrician aristocrats and the plebeian commoners. The attitude of the former towards the latter is one of condescension. The latter are without rights. 'Among the patricians, who later came to be the senators, spirit of exclusiveness was rampant. They could contract legal marriage only among themselves. Their pride and exclusiveness led them to lay down that no Roman shall marry a non-Roman, unless he belonged to one of the special nationalities, taking of a bride from among whom was permissible. Thus the early Romans were hypergamous towards others and the patricians endogamous among themselves. This pride of birth and spirit of exclusiveness continued among the patricians and similar people for a long time. Even Cicero harped on the importance of birth; and stoic philosophers while toying with the brotherhood of mankind in the abstract went on detesting the plebs and the slaves and their lowly occupations. The plebs and others were far more interested in their political rights and their economic welfare than in social exclusiveness or its opposite, assimilation with

the senators. The few aristocratic families settled in the city suffered great diminution in their numbers, through incessant wars, frequent infertility and repeated political massacres. Thus the aristocratic leaven did not find congenial medium. Nor was it large enough for vital action.[8]

Secondly, Roman religion, though a formal one and consequently one in which ideas of rigid procedure and of ceremonial purity should prosper, did not much develop in that line. And nothing marks so well the contrasting attitudes to life and the divergent fate of the Romans and the Indians as the vicissitudes of their original religion among the two peoples. From very early times religion in Rome becomes institutonalized and established, the college of pontiffs being charged with keeping the status quo. As almost everything else the religious field too is invaded by politics. If religion by being a kind of a handmaid of politics ceases to grow in its own line it runs to decay owing to the growth of the practice of business and consequent desire for gain. In this respect the condition reached by Roman religion before the beginning of the Christian era was entered into by Hindu religion only about the beginning of the twentieth century. There was no scope for the elaboration of the ideas of ceremonial purity and their application to social life.

Thirdly, the religion of the Romans was a religion of farmers. And the leading farmers got confined into a city. Their religion not having changed it naturally got devoid of vitality. It soon fell an easy prey to various cults from the conquered Orient. Yet it could not offer a satisfying creed and practice to its adherents. And the final result of this growing situation was the more or less easy triumph of Christianity.[9] Small wonder that Roman religion failed to co-operate with the exclusive spirit of the Roman aristocrats.

Fourthly, the existence and the early great growth of slavery with its attendant occupational grading or degrading proved to be one of the most potent factors against the deve-

lopment of exclusive stratification. The number of slaves was so large even before the end of the Republic that the free population was almost swamped. The composition of the slave population was a significant aspect of Roman slavery. The slaves were largely either Greeks or Hellenized Orientals like the Egyptians, the Syrians and even the Jews or the Latins and the Western Barbarians. Most of them were not different from the Romans in external appearances of race. Many of them were even of superior mien. And quite a large number were well educated and cultured. The Syrians and Jews in particular were expert in business. We read of many slave-risings. The unrest of the slaves was helped by the policy of manumission, which because of its economic advantages to slave-owning Romans rapidly grew in practice. The freed men, as the manumissioned slaves were known, played a significant role in Roman economic system. Slavery of able and not ugly people was an effective check against discriminating stratification of ranks and classes within the body of the Romans.[10]

We can see why the Romans, beginning their account with many of the characteristics common to a number of Indo-Europeans, ended during the course of some centuries on a different note. Their economic organization came to depend on what was called the colony system but was in reality the same thing as serfdom.[11] Their religion was supplanted by Christianity which in theory at least could not countenance exclusive spirit.

The Celts and the Anglo-Saxons, as is seen in the previous chapter, lacked in many of the special features attendant on the settlement of the Romans in their new habitat. They developed their original traits after the Hindu pattern more or less. Their civilization was rather rudimentary for a long time. During that period the Celts, who had retained their original religion, showed the exclusive spirit though not backed by the slight religious development that had taken place. The Anglo-Saxons, though they had accepted Christianity, exhibited the exclusive spirit. And the priests of the Celts, the

Druids, had developed enough power and had devised rules and their sanctions which are reminiscent of the Brahmins of India. Caesar has preserved the important information that they interdicted recalcitrant persons from the sacrifices and that such excommunicated persons were looked upon as of the number of the impious and criminal. All persons shunned them and avoided not only their touch but also speech with them, lest they should be hurt by their contagion.[12]

One may safely conclude from the above account that the Indo-European peoples, of whom the Vedic Aryans were but a branch, had early developed the exclusive spirit in social behaviour and had cultivated a partiality for ideas of ceremonial purity. Some of them in their separate developments actually elaborated them into an exclusive social stratification, though of rather limited extent and depth.

It is very instructive to observe the behaviour of the European conquerors and settlers from the 16th century onwards. For these modern representatives of the early Indo-Europeans, of the Latins, of the Celts and of the Teutons or Anglo-Saxons, had by that time been imbibing the liberalizing tenets of Christianity for about eight to ten centuries, asking them to treat men as brothers and exhorting them to cast off pride and exclusiveness. In spite of the equalitarian and democratic preaching of centuries wherever the Europeans went as conquerors they manifested exclusiveness varying from utter contempt and strictest barrier to condescension and hypergamous feeling and practice. Wherever they condescended they at most took the conquered women to wives but never even connived at their own women marrying the native males. Even in this hypergamous practice they took care to separate the progeny of half-breeds.

The behaviour of exclusive pride towards conquered peoples of whatever cultural status or racial mien met with in the doings of so many Indo-European peoples, whether under the continuance of their tribal religions or even under the acceptance of Christianity, appears in the attitudes and prac-

tices of the Aryans of the Gangetic plains of the Vedic or post-Vedic age in a particular context. Their conquered were a dark people. When they entered India they must have had among them at least three well-defined classes, intermarriage between whom must have been rather rare, though not positively forbidden. Their first regulations in this line began with the task of excluding the Śūdras, which class must have been largely formed by the aborigines, from their religious worship. We have seen that the Śūdra was represented as the lowest class in society. Very early in their Indian history the Aryans enjoined that the Śūdra shall not practise the religious worship developed by them. They even forbade his presence in the sacrificial hall. The three first castes were first enjoined not to marry a Śūdra female before any other restriction of an endogamous nature was tried to be promulgated. A Śūdra male trying to marry a Brahmin female was the greatest sacrilege that could be perpetrated against society. The various factors that characterize caste-society were the result, in the first instance, of the attempts on the part of the upholders of the Brahmanic civilization to exclude the aborigines and the Śūdras from religious and social communion with themselves. That the Śūdra class was largely formed by those aborigines who had accepted the over-lordship of the Indo-Aryans and had entered into their service is more than probable. It will have been noticed that in the earliest literature only the first three classes—the Brahmin, the Kshatriya, and the Vaisya—are postulated and that it is only in one place, which is regarded by most Vedic scholars to be chronologically one of the latest, that the Śūdra class is mentioned as one of the four. It has not been found possible yet to give a satisfactory derivation of the word Śūdra in terms of Sanskritic roots. Further, when this fourth class is definitely formulated the brahmanic literature contemplates it as in contradistinction to the other three classes. Thus the Vedic opposition between the Ārya and the Dāsa is replaced by the brahmanic classification of the "dvijāti" and the "ekajāti" (the Śūdra), suggesting the transmutation of the Dāsa into the Śūdra in the minds of the writers of the Brahmanic and later periods .

That the main ingredient of caste-system, viz. the regulation of endogamy or rather its earlier form, permitted hypergamy, was the result of the desire on the part of the Aryans of the Gangetic plain to preserve their physical purity and cultural integrity is a proposition which finds almost unequivocal support in the distribution of physical types in Northern India. It is very instructive and even necessary to bear in mind that, even as late as 150 B.C. when Patanjali the great grammarian wrote, "the physical characteristics of a Brahmin were fair skin, and tawny hair." Patanjali declares them to be the intrinsic traits marking a Brahmin, and black colour of the skin that of a non-Brahmin (*Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāshya*, Sūtra II, 2, 6.)

Basing my calculation on some of the physical measurements taken by anthropologists and using one of the statistical devices to gauge the nearness of distance of one caste from another in the totality of these measurements, I have established a general correspondence between finer physical type and high position in the caste-hierarchy. Taking the Brahmin of the United Provinces (Uttar Pradeśa) as the typical representative of the ancient Aryans one finds that the group is physically more like the Khatri, a high caste, and even the Chuhra, a low caste of the Panjab, than like any caste of the United Provinces except the Chhatri, the next highest to the Brahmin in caste hierarchy. Thus the highest caste of the United Provinces has greater physical affinity even with the low caste of the Panjab than with most castes of its own region. If the Panjab castes should be taken to represent in the main the old Aryan stock then the U. P. Brahmin as a good representative of the same stock should naturally show this relation. U. P. Brahmin's separateness from most of the lower castes of his region shows that he has succeeded in keeping his physical type as undiluted as possible under the circumstances. The physical likeness between the various castes of the United Provinces more or less corresponds with the precedence of caste. The Chhatri which is the next caste to the Brahmin shows the greatest likeness to him. The Kayasth comes next and is followed by the Ahir and the Kurmi, the former a high

caste of intellectual pursuits and the latter two artisan castes of high status. The Pasi and the untouchable Chamar show much less likeness and in that order. In the scheme of social precedence the Kayasth occupies the fourth rank, the Kurmi stands at the head of the eighth, while the Pasi and the Chamars the eleventh and the twelfth ranks.[13] Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis concludes his survey of the U. P. castes thus: "The Brahmins occupy the highest social position in Hindu society at the top of the picture, and have the largest build of face and body with tall stature, large facial breadth, and comparatively large nasal length and biggest nasal depth but narrow nasal breadth. As one goes down from the top to the bottom of the picture there is a steady decrease in both social status and physical size (except in the case of the degraded castes, Bhatu, Habru and Dom)".[14]

The facts stated above acquire even greater significance when it is known that by the same method of comparison the Brahmin of Bihar is more distant in physical likeness from the Brahmin of the United Provinces than are the Chhatri, the Kayasth and the Kurmi from the latter.

Comparing the castes of Bihar among themselves the physical affinity grades some of the castes in the order Brahmin, Kurmi, Chamar and Dom, while social precedence not disturbing the relative order places the Kurmi in the third place and the Chamar and the Dom in the fifth and sixth.[15] Here again though the Brahmin is not the same as the Brahmin of the U. P. he has managed to keep himself at the apex of the physical ladder.

Similar comparisons instituted in respect of the castes of Bengal and of Bombay show a slightly different pattern. While many of the high castes standing in physical proximity of the Brahmin of Bengal establish the inference that intermixture with him "has varied directly as the cultural proximity of the caste concerned", the close resemblance of the Chaṇḍāl, who touch pollutes is rather unexpected. Similarly in the comparisons instituted by Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis, the

physical distance of the Bengal Brahmin from the Bihar Brahmin and the even greater distinctness from the U. P. Brahmin contrasted with his close likeness with the Panjab Khatri are equally disturbing. One of his conclusions may be quoted here for its great relevance. He observes: "The influence of the northern Indian castes decreases and that of the aboriginal tribes of Chota Nagpur increases as we go down the social scale".[16] The Desasth Brahmin of Mahārāshtra proclaims his physical affinity with the Son Koli rather than with his social compeer the Chitpavan Brahmin. In Gujarat the data of the anthropometric survey of the 1931 Census of India reveal the close affinity of the Nagar Brahmin with Bania-Jain. Another section of Brahmins, the Audich, however, shows a wider distance from the Nagar Brahmin than even the Kathi.[17] The Audich, as the name signifies, are a Northern immigrant group.

In general in a linguistic region the castes are physically more related to one another than to similar castes outside the region. Outside the United Provinces there appear to be some castes rather low in the social scale which are physically more akin to the highest caste than are the middle ones. The origin of endogamy in the earlier form of hypergamy may be placed in the Gangetic plain and attributed to the Brahmanic culture whose literature provides the earliest word picture of such a state of things. The idea of endogamy and other elements of caste were taken by the Brahmin prospectors with them. Hence in the other regions as much correspondence between physical type and social status is not met with. The prospectors could not disturb the physical mixture of the region where they went. They could only try to apply their scheme of occupational segregation and endogamy to various groups according to their receptive abilities. I may conclude that caste in India is a Brahmanic child of the Indo-Aryan culture, cradled in the land of the Gangā and the Yamunā and thence transferred to other parts of the country.

This racial origin of the principal feature of the caste-system is further supported by the early term 'varṇa' meaning

colour used to specify the orders in society. Later on the word 'jāti' is specialized to denote caste, which is a group the membership of which is acquired by birth. The word 'jāti' etymologically means 'something into which one is born." It is occasionally used by good ancient authorities as equivalent to 'varṇa'.

As an important constituent of the Brahmanic culture in connection with the sacrificial ritual the Aryan notions of ceremonial purity took on an exaggerated aspect. Not only the correct wording and pronunciation of the sacred formulae but also the strictest adherence to the minutest details of the ritual procedure were essential for the proper performance of rites. Distinctions began to be made between things pure and things impure. Whatever was unclean was of course impure. And with the change of outlook on the animal world even some of the formerly honourable occupations came to be looked upon as degrading. How fastidious the Brahmanic ideal of ceremonial purity had come to be by the time of the Sūtras is best illustrated by the meticulous rules laid down in them for purification and for general conduct.

The Brahmins, partly out of their honest desire to preserve the purity of Vedic ritual, partly being the victims of their own ideas of ceremonial purity, and partly also owing to their consciousness of superiority over the aborigines, first enacted rules for the guidance of their own members, which were intended to prevent the possibilty of the Śūdras in any way lowering their moral standard and introducing their low blood.

It is because the Brahmins put restrictions on the acceptance of food and drink from the Śūdras during the second stage of the development of their culture that we find that in Northern India generally there is some leniency shown by them towards some of the higher castes, while in Southern India such an attitude and practice is considered a great sacrilege. As the taboo was laid against the Śūdra, and as the Brahmin most probably continued to treat the other two

castes as almost his own equals in this matter, even when in later times the taboo became stricter and was made widely applicable, by force of habit and tradition, he continued to take water from pure castes and specially prepared food from high castes. When the pioneers of Brahmanic culture progressed into Southern India with restrictions against food and water from the Śūdra as one of the items of their tradition, as they had none of the other castes—the Kshatriya and the Vaiśya—to whom they were accustomed, to think of in their new regions, they applied their rules against the Śūdras to all the indigenous population of the Southern countries. And the seed fell on a very congenial soil. The Southern peoples before their contact with the Indo-Aryan culture most probably had beliefs about the sanctity and power of food to transmit certain qualities very much like those of primitive peoples.[18] This is why the restrictions on food and drink are so rigorous in South India, where, as I said, the Brahmin does not accept food or water at the hands of anyone but a Brahmin.

With the progressive assimilation of the Vaiśyas with the Śūdras the Brahmins enacted rules to keep their group free from admixture with them by assigning different status to the issue of the union of a Brahmin male and a Vaiśya female. And with the march of time and particularly after the overthrow of Buddhism they stopped taking food at the hands of the Vaiśyas. Owing to the peculiar position of the Kshatriyas, the king having belonged to that group, in theory at least the Brahmins did not prohibit food being taken at their hands. Yet they tried to preserve their racial purity by treating the off-spring of a Brahmin male and a Kshatriya female as belonging to a separate group.

The restrictions on intermarriage and on food were thus in their origin the outcome of the Brahmins' desire to keep themselves pure. This desire was partly due to the exaggerated notions of purity, partly to the enormous importance that came to be attached to the perpetuation of Vedic lore without even the slightest change, and in part also to the pride of superiority, which the Brahmins had shared in

common with the other Indo-Aryan classes in the beginning, and which they alone could keep unimpaired. The total discomfiture of the Kshatriyas and the complete dissociation of the language of the people from the old language of the scriptures made it easy for the Brahmins to have it all their own way.

It must, however, be said to the credit of the Brahmins that they did not quite forget the original solidarity of the first three classes. They tried to preserve the purity, on their model of course, of both the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas at least in their ideal scheme, though they treated the latter for all practical purposes as equal to the Śūdras.

This social pattern set for themselves by the most respected class in society could not fail to be imitated with fervid enthusiasm by all manner of groups that would claim respectability. Thus it must have been that the original restrictions on intermarriage and regulations about the acceptance of food, which contemplated only four classes in society, came to be the characteristics of each and every well-marked group.

Group solidarity and group prestige would soon assert themselves against marrying on unequal terms: the lower group would refuse to marry their females to the males of the higher classes only to create a new group giving itself superior airs. It was bound to close up its ranks and be endogamous.

With functional differentiation in society there came into being separate occupational groups with more or less distinct interests. We have noticed it as a widespread feature of ancient and medieval society that the occupation of each group tends to become customarily hereditary among its members. Only the Brahmins reserved as their monopoly the occupation of a priest. No doubt they were in the beginning inspired by the laudable motive of preserving the all-important sacred lore. But later on they looked upon their priestcraft as their monopolistic activity and rigorously kept it up, while the

traditional occupations of the other two castes were progressively encroached upon by other castes. There is also a natural inclination for each occupational group, as we have already noticed, to be habitually endogamous. Both these tendencies became rules: the former more or less nebulous, and the latter very rigid, after the pattern of the Brahmins. Occupations thus became endogamous groups.

The attitude of respect for details that was first fostered in connection with ritual became the prevailing attitude in social behaviour. Adherence to detail of social and customary etiquette became the distinguishing mark of membership of a group. Distinction in any detail tended to be translated into separateness of membership and hence of a group.

The lack of rigid unitary control of the State, the unwillingness of the rulers to enforce a uniform standard of law and custom, their readiness to recognize the varying customs of different groups as valid, and their usual practice of allowing things somehow to adjust themselves[19] helped the fissiparous tendency of groups and fostered the spirit of solidarity and community feeling in every group.

Both these circumstances conspired to encourage the formation of small groups based on petty distinctions.

Special rights for the higher classes and disabilities on the lower ones was almost a universal feature of class-society; and the Brahmanic theory of four castes with their rights and disabilities does not call for any special explanation. Only the practice of untouchability is peculiar to the Hindu system. It will have been clear from the history of this factor of caste, narrated in the third and fourth chapters, that the ideas of untouchability and unapproachability arose out of the ideas of ceremonial purity, first applied to the aboriginal Śūdras in connection with the sacrificial ritual and expanded and extended to other groups because of the theoretical impurity of certain occupations.

Multiplicity of the groups and the thoroughness of the whole system are due to the habit of the Hindu mind to create categories and to carry things to their logical end, a characteristic manifest in their literature, philosophy, and religious creeds.[20]

1. See C. C. North, *Social Differentiation.*
2. Untouchability in Japan can hardly be regarded as quite independent of the Indian ideas on the subject.
3. *E.B.*, XVII, pp. 565-66.
4. Ibid., pp. 568, 570, 580, 582.
5. Jowett's *Dialogues of Plato*, vol. V. p. 267.
6. Op. cit., pp. 80, 83-4, 86, 87, 98.
7. Russell, B., *Power*, p. 52.
8. Dill (1), pp. 1, 3, 38, 102-03, 104, 273, 282; Warde Fowler, pp. 43-44, 61, 97-99, 101; Louis, pp. 30-33; 110-11, 148-9; Duff, pp. 200-01, 207; Geer, pp. 161-3.
9. Dill, (1), pp. 529-35, 537, 543-45; Warde Fowler, pp. 154, 320-23, 331; Louis, p. 151; Geer, pp. 173-75, 187-191; 279-89.
10. Dill, (1), pp. 100-103; Warde Fowler, pp. 69, 204-07; Louis, 37, 39, 42-3, 46, 130, 135-7, 140, 144, 147-8; Duff, pp. 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 19, 188, 190-1, 202-04; Geer, p. 169.
11. Louis, pp. 214-15, 241-45, 252-57.
12. Seebohm F., *Tribal Custom in Anglo-Saxon Law* (1911), p. 118.
13. *United Provinces Census Report*, 1901, p. 248.
14. *Sankhyā*, IX (1949), p. 199.
15. *Bengal Census Report*, 1901, p. 373.
16. J.A.S.B., XXIII (1927), pp. 310, 311, 319; Ghurye in *Q. J. of the Mythic Society*, vol. XVII, Nos. 3 & 4, p. 17 (of the Reprint).
17. G. S. Ghurye in *The Q. J. of the Mythic Society*, vol. XXVII, Nos. 3 & 4, pp. 34-35, (Reprint).
18. A. E. Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, 1902, pp. 157-60. On p. 162 he thus summarizes the attitude towards food: "It is clear that men believe human properties to be transmitted not only by contact with the food of others, but by eating with them or in their presence."
19. See V. A. Gadgil in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1926, p. 161, for the connection of this practice with the village-organization of Northern India.
20. Professor C. G. Seligman attributes this mental trait to the Nordic race (see his presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Institute, J.R.A.I. 1924).

8

Caste and British Rule

We have seen that the Brahmin was at the apex of the hierarchical organization of caste and that the Hindu kings upheld the institution with the help of their civil power. With the advent of the British as the political head of society things were bound to take on a different aspect. The British brought with them their own traditional form of government, and as Christians they could not have much sympathy with the institutions of the Hindus. As prudent foreigners wishing to consolidate their power over a strange land and people they decided to leave the peculiar institutions of the country severely alone except where they egregiously violated their cherished ideas of government. They introduced a system of education which did not demand of the learners any change of religion. Ideas and behaviour patterns, very different from those to which the people were accustomed, were thus presented as isolated from religion. The policy of comparative non-interference naturally gave scope for the revolt of the castes that were not quite comfortable under the Brahmin supremacy. Later on with the incoming of the modern industrial organization and the growth of industrial cities, large numbers of peoples congregated in cities of mixed populations, away from the influence of their homes and unobserved by their caste or village people. This is the background of the picture of contemporary caste. In this chapter I shall trace the consequences of these circumstances on our institution.

Early in the history of the British rule the practice of the rulers over the three Presidencies was not uniform. In Bengal one of the Regulations, while recognizing the integrity of caste organization, allowed suits for restoration of caste to be entertained by the ordinary courts.[1] It was held that cases of expulsion from clubs or voluntary associations were of an

entirely different nature from excommunication from caste.[2] In Bombay, however, the pertinent regulation expressly provides that no court shall interfere in any caste question, "beyond the admission and trial of any suit instituted for the recovery of damages on account of the alleged injury to the caste and character of the plaintiff arising from some illegal act of the other party."[3] Social privileges of the membership of a caste are held to be wholly within the jurisdiction of the caste. It is only when a complainant alleges that a legal right either of property or of office is violated by his exclusion from the caste that a suit may be entertained by a court of law.[4] This autonomy of caste, it is further held, exists only under the law and not against it. Hence caste-proceedings must be according to usage, giving reasonable opportunity of explanation to the person concerned and must not be influenced by malice.[5]

This recognition of the integrity of caste for internal affairs did not protect the institution from inroads on some of its very vital powers. The establishment of British courts, administering a uniform criminal law, removed from the purview of caste many matters that used to be erstwhile adjudicated by it. Questions of assault, adultery, rape, and the like were taken before the British courts for decision, and the caste councils in proportion lost their former importance. Even in matters of civil law, such as marriage, divorce, etc., though the avowed intention of the British was to be guided by caste-customs slowly but surely various decisions of the High Courts practically set aside the authority of caste.

The first British administrators on the Bombay side employed, as early as 1826, officials like Borradaile and Steele, to make compilations of the various usages and customs of the many castes of the presidency. These painstaking officers made useful compilations. But similar compendiums were not prepared in other provinces. The result was that the Widow-remarriage Act of 1856 contained clauses practically violating the customs of some of the so-called lower castes.

While legalizing the marriage of a Hindu widow, this Act deprived such a remarried widow of all her rights and interests in her deceased husband's property. Fortunately the courts have taken reasonable view of these sections of the Act, and have decreed that the Act with its restrictive clauses applies only to those widows who could not, without the aid of this Act, remarry according to their caste-usage. Widows of castes allowing remarriage forfeited their rights and interests in their deceased husband's property only when caste-usage enjoined such forfeiture.[6]

So early as 1876, the High Court of Bombay ruled that "Courts of law will not recognize the authority of a caste to declare a marriage void, or to give permission to a woman to remarry".[7] When any caste-council, in utter ignorance of its changed status, ventures to step in as a tribunal to try one of its defaulting members, it is promptly made to realize the force of law. It is well known that one of the most usual methods in the old regime of detecting an offence was to submit the accused person to an ordeal of varying intensity. Recently the caste-council of Pakhah Rajputs of Ahmedabad submitted a man and his mother, both accused of witchcraft, to an ordeal usual in such cases. As one of the suspects failed to come out successful, the council demanded penalty for the alleged crime. A suit was filed for recovery of this penalty but was dismissed as being against policy. Thereupon one of the persons lodged a complaint for defamation against the persons who had complained against them to the caste-council.[8]

The hereditary and prescriptive right of the Brahmins to act as priests to all castes of the Hindus, with only a few exceptions, has been the one uniform and general principle inhering in caste society through all its vicissitudes. Later on I shall describe the attitude of the people towards this question; but here I should like to point out how certain decisions of the High Courts have emboldened the non-Brahmanic castes to dislodge the Brahmins from their monopoly of priesthood. In Bengal and in North India generally

it is now settled that there is no office of priest recognized as such in law, and a householder may employ anyone he likes for the performance of any priestly service and pay the fees to him. A similar view has been taken in the Madras Presidency.[9] When in the Maratha country the non-Brahmin reformists started the practice of performing their religious rites without the aid of the Brahmin priests, the latter lodged a complaint asking for an injunction against the persons so violating their rights. The High Court of Bombay decreed that people could engage any priest they liked, and were not at all bound to call for the services of the hereditary priest; but unlike the High Court of Madras, they decreed that the hereditary priest must be paid some fees by way of compensation.[10]

This opens the way to the dissolution of the only bond holding together the diverse castes, viz. the employment of common priesthood.

The Castes-Disabilities Removal Act of 1850 dealt another blow at the integrity of caste. The Act does not, as may be expected from its title, remove civil disabilities existing between caste and caste but facilitates conversion to another religion or admission into another caste. Notwithstanding any custom of caste disinheriting a person for change of caste or religion, this Act provides that a person does not forfeit his ordinary rights of property by loss of caste or change of religion.

Regarding the most important aspect, and almost the only surviving one, viz. that of prohibition against marriage outside the caste, the practice of the British courts has varied. In some early cases it was held that marriages between persons belonging to different divisions of the Brahmins or the Śūdras were invalid unless specially sanctioned by custom; but recent decisions decree otherwise. In a Madras case when a Hindu, belonging to the Śūdra class, married a Christian woman, turned into a Hindu, the marriage was accepted as one between members of different divisions of the Śūdra class and

therefore valid. Integrity of caste was so far recognized that the Court held that where a caste regards marriage as valid and treats the parties as its members, the Court cannot declare it null and void.[11]

Social reformers, however, were not satisfied with the existing state of affairs, and legislators tried to introduce bills legalizing intercaste marriages. The Special Marriage Act of 1872 made it possible for an Indian of whatever caste or creed to enter into a valid marriage with a person belonging to any caste or creed, provided the parties registered the contract of marriage, declaring *inter alia* that they did not belong to any religion. The clause requiring the solemn renunciation of caste and religion by the parties to a civil marriage was considered a great hardship and a moral dilemma by all progressive elements in the country. To add to this grievance, members of the Brahmo Samaj, who were regarded as outside the purview of this Act, were held, by a decision of the Privy Council to be Hindus for the purposes of the Act. Marriages of Brahmo-Samajists could no longer be valid unless the parties signed a declaration that they did not belong to any caste or religion. Continued agitation was carried on by reformers to liberalize the marriage law. Owing partially to the apathy of the Government and the hostility of the conservative section of the Hindus, both B. N. Basu and Vithalbhai Patel, one after the other, failed in their efforts in this direction. It was only in the Reformed Legislature that Sir Hari Sing Gour succeeded in getting a pertinent bill passed into law, though not in the original form intended by the first reformers. It is known as the Special Marriage Amendment Act of 1923. It applies only to Hindus including Jains, Sikhs, and Brahmos. Persons marrying under the provisions of this Act, to whatever caste they may belong, need not make the declaration prescribed in the Act of 1872. This advantage, however, is gained not without a substantial sacrifice. If two Hindus belonging to different castes marry under this Act they are not required to renounce their religion in declaration but have to forfeit certain of their personal rights as Hindus. They cannot adopt. On their marriage they cease to be the

members of the joint family to which they previously belonged. Whatever rights in the property of the family would have accrued to them by survivorship under the Hindu Law cease. As regards their own property they will be governed by the Indian Succession Act and not by the Hindu Law.[12]

Under the old regime of caste certain sections of Hindu society which were regarded as untouchable were devoid of many of the civil rights. The question of removing their disabilities and placing them on a footing of civil equality came up for consideration before the British administrators. In 1856 the Government of Bombay had to consider the case of a Mahar boy, who was refused admission to the Government School at Dharwar. The principle involved in the case occupied the attention of the Government for about two years. Finally in 1858 it was announced in a press-note that "although the Governor-in-Council does not contemplate the introduction of low-caste pupils into schools, the expenses of which are shared with Government by local contributors and patrons who object to such a measure, he reserves to himself the full right of refusing the support of Government to any partially aided school in which the benefits of education are withheld from any class of persons on account of caste or race, and further resolves that all schools maintained at the sole cost of Government shall be open to all classes of its subjects without distinction".[13] In a pressnote of 1915 we still find the complaint that contact with Western civilization and English education had not successfully combated the old ideas about untouchability. It further refers to the "familiar sight of Mahar and other depressed class boys in village schools where the boys are often not allowed to enter the schoolroom but are accommodated outside the room on the verandah". In 1923 the Government issued a resolution that no grants would be paid to any aided educational institution which refused admission to the children of the Depressed Classes. By this time the practice of segregating the Depressed Class boys was fast disappearing especially in the Central Division of the presidency. In many Local Board and Municipal schools Depressed Class pupils are now allowed to sit in their classes

like boys and girls of the caste Hindus.

While the Bombay Government was thus enforcing the right of the Depressed Classes to equal treatment, the Madras Government had on its Statute-book so late as the end of 1923 a law empowering village Magistrates to punish the offenders of the lower castes by imprisonment in the stocks though the Government had definitely pledged itself in 1914 to discontinue this inhuman practice.[14] In 1925 a Bill was introduced in the Madras Legislative Council to put under statute the principle of a resolution passed in the previous session of the Council throwing open all public roads, streets, or pathways, giving access to any public office, well, tank, or place of public resort, to all classes of people including the Depressed.[15]

In the Reformed Constitution the Depressed Classes got special representation in local and Legislative bodies by nomination.

The majority of the castes which were under various disabilities, excluding the Depressed Classes, were non-Brahmin. The uniform laws of the British did not recognize any of these disabilities as lawful. Yet the services were mainly manned by Brahmin and allied castes, who were the first to profit by English education. Their traditional attitude towards caste naturally influenced their dealings with the non-Brahmin classes. This situation gradually awakened some of the non-Brahmin leaders and sympathetic officers of the Government to demand special treatment to those half-submerged classes. As a response, Chatfield, the Director of Public Instruction in Bombay, allowed in 1878 some concessions in the matter of fees in primary schools to the boys of some of these castes. Later on were instituted scholarships in secondary schools and colleges for boys from some of them.

The early non-Brahmin leaders had urged upon the Government the necessity of special representation for their members both in the administrative bodies as well as in the

services. For a pretty long time this appeal remained unheeded. The cry was, however, taken up by the late Maharaja of Kolhapur,[16] and a strong case for it was made by him at the time when Montague came to India to consult the people and the Government of India as regards the future form of Government. In the reformed constitution framed by Montague and Lord Chelmsford special representation through mixed electorates was conceded to the non-Brahmins. Under these provisions the whole Hindu populace in the Bombay Presidency is divided into three sections: Brahmins and allied castes, the intermediate classes formed by Marathas and others, and the backward classes including the so-called untouchables.[17] This classification, with the addition of other Indians like the Parsis in the appropriate section, is also followed in recruiting the various services. A Resolution of the Government of Bombay Finance Department, dated 17th September, 1923, expressly prohibited recruitment to the lower services from the advanced class of Brahmins and others till a certain proportion of the posts is held by members of the intermediate and backward classes.[18] It is because of this avowed intention of the Government to see certain castes represented in the services of the Province that heads of Government Institutions, while inviting applications for vacancies under their charge require the applicant to state his caste and sub-caste.[19]

British administrators, following the popular practice, have used caste names as a convenient mode of description of persons. The Police Reports while giving details about offenders also mention their caste. The Railway risk-note, that every sender of parcels has to fill in and sign, had, at least till very recently, an entry for the caste of the sender.[20] This cannot be regarded as intended to give or elicit information as regards the person's occupation. There is a separate entry provided to describe one's profession. Perhaps the caste-entry has been inserted to enable the officers concerned to form a rough estimate of the moral character of the person.

The unique institution of caste did not fail to arouse intellectual curiosity among the more intelligent of the Briti-

shers in India, officials as well as non-officials, and our understanding of the institution is largely helped by their work. Some of the early officials like Elliot, Dalton, Sherring, and Nesfield, evinced their interest in the subject by collecting information and publishing it with their comments. Later officials, however, adopted the easier method of utilizing the decennial census for collecting and presenting the information and indulging in the theories of the origins of caste.[21] This procedure reached its culmination in the Census of 1901 under the guidance of Sir Herbert Risley of ethnographic fame. With a view to helping "us towards presenting an intelligible picture of the social grouping of that large proportion of the people of India which is organized, admittedly or tacitly, on the basis of caste" the Census Commissioner changed the classification of 1891 into one based on "social precedence as recognized by the native public opinion at the present day and manifesting itself in the facts that particular castes are supposed to be the modern representatives of one or other of the castes of the theoretical Hindu system". And this procedure Risley chose in spite of his clear admission that even in this caste-ridden society a person, when questioned about his caste, may offer a bewildering variety of replies: "He may give the name of a sect, of a sub-caste, of an exogamous sect or section, of a hypergamous group; he may mention some titular designation which sounds finer than the name of his caste; he may describe himself by his occupation or by the province or tract of country from which he comes."[22] Various ambitious castes quickly perceived the chances of raising their status. They invited conferences of their members, and formed councils to take steps to see that their status was recorded in the way they thought was honourable to them. Other castes that could not but resent this "stealthy" procedure to advance, equally eagerly began to controvert their claims. Thus a campaign of mutual recrimination was set on foot. "The leaders of all but the highest castes frankly looked upon the Census as an opportunity for pressing and perhaps obtaining some recognition of social claims which were denied by persons of castes higher than their own."[23] In 1911 the Census-reporter for Madras wrote the following: "It has been pointed

out to me by an Indian gentleman that the last few years, and especially the occasion of the present census, have witnessed an extraordinary revival of the caste spirit in certain aspects. For numerous caste 'Sabhas' have sprung up, each keen to assert the dignity of the social group which it represents."[24]

It is difficult to see any valid public reason for this elaborate treatment of caste in the Census-reports. The Government have never avowed their intention of helping every caste to retain its numbers and prosperity. Nor have they any time helped a particular caste because it registered numerical decline or economic dislocation. Not even the declared policy of the Provincial Governments to provide special representation either by election or nomination to certain classes of people necessitates an enumeration of the people by their castes. For this representation is not dependent on numbers. It is not proportional. All that the particular officers of the Government have to do is to determine in the light of their experience whether a particular person is one who can legitimately claim to belong to one of the three large groups of the population, devised for political purposes. And a Court of Law in any disputed case will settle the point by reference to the usual practice of the people. The conclusion is unavoidable that the intellectual curiosity of some of the early officials is mostly responsible for the treatment of caste given to it in the Census, which has become progressively elaborate in each successive Census since 1872. The total result has been a livening up of the caste-spirit.

In the old regime one caste used to petition the sovereign to restrain another caste from carrying a procession through a particular street or from using a particular mark. Such cases are on record in the Diaries of the Peshwas. The British Government in India by their declared policy effectively discouraged such interference and thus removed some of the occasions for a demonstration of the bitter caste-spirit. On the other hand, the desire of the Census officials to give an intelligible picture of caste by means of nice grading of contem-

porary groups has provided a good rallying point for the old caste-spirit.

The one undisputed consequence of the promulgation of a uniform law and of certain administrative measures has been the removal of almost all the legal inequality in the treatment of different castes—particularly the so-called low castes. Only in the case of the Depressed castes has the Government not proceeded to the logical end. One of the disabilities that these castes, which are proud to call themselves Hindus, and which the higher castes eagerly claim as of their fold in a controversy about political representation of the Hindus, is that they are denied access to Hindu temples. They are required to stop outside the temple proper in the compound and satisfy themselves that they have had a glimpse of the idol of God. A devout Hindu feels very strongly that his homage and prayer to God must be paid in full sight of the idol of God. Hindu religion is not an established church. There are temples for the idols of God maintained by private individuals or by public trusts. The latter sometimes receive grants from the State. The famous temple of Parvati at Poona is such a one. The Depressed Classes want to visit the temple as other caste-Hindus do. The trustees refuse to allow them the right. The Government of Bombay, who make a substantial grant towards the maintenance of the temple, have not yet thought fit to intervene as a matter of public policy. I fail to see how the Government, that has accepted the principle that whichever institution is maintained either wholly or partially with the help of public money must impose no bar on any person merely because of his caste or creed, can contemplate with unconcern the distressing plight of the Depressed Classes for a practical demonstration of their elementary rights. It is clearly the duty of the Government, still sadly undischarged, to declare that the problem of access to the Hindu temples that receive any support out of the public money, must be solved on a basis agreed to by the representatives of all the classes of the Hindus, and that failing such an agreement, grants of money from public funds should be stopped.

The British Government, we have seen, did not recognize caste as a unit empowered to administer justice. Caste was thus shorn of one of its important functions as a community. Individual members might, therefore, be expected to feel less of the old feeling of solidarity for their caste-group. But nothing of the kind is observed to have taken place.[25] First, though a caste could not administer justice, the Government would not set aside the customs of a caste in matters of civil law unless they were opposed to public policy. Caste thus retained its cultural integrity. Secondly, many other aspects of the British Administration, some of which like the Census have been dealt with above, provided more than sufficient incentive for the consolidation of the caste-group. Mr. Middleton, one of the two Superintendents of Census Operations of 1921, makes eloquent remarks about the effects of the British Administration on caste in the Panjab. He observes: "I had intended pointing out that there is a very wide revolt against the classification of occupational castes; that these castes have been largely manufactured and almost entirely preserved as separate castes by the British Government. Our land records and official documents have added iron bonds to the old rigidity of caste. Caste in itself was rigid among the higher castes, but malleable amongst the lower. We pigeon-holed every one by caste, and if we could not find a true caste for them, labelled them with the name of an hereditary occupation. We deplore the caste-system and its effects on social and economic problems, but we are largely responsible for the system which we deplore. Left to themselves such castes as Sunar and Lohar would rapidly disappear and no one would suffer. . . . Government's passion for labels and pigeon-holes has led to a crystallization of the caste system, which, except amongst the aristocratic castes, was really very fluid under indigenous rule. . . . If the Government would ignore caste it would gradually be replaced by something very different amongst the lower castes."[26] The situation in the Panjab cannot be taken as typical of other provinces. It is well known that the Panjab was not much influenced by rigid caste-system. Yet the process of pigeon-holing and thus stereotyping has undoubtedly counteracted whatever good results might have

ensued from the dethronement of caste as a unit of the administration of justice.[27] The total effect has been, at the least, to keep caste-solidarity quite intact.[28]

The relations of an individual member to a group in which he is born, and to which he is bound by ties, traditional, sentimental, and cultural, in a society where almost everyone belongs to one of such groups, and none can hope to have any respectable status without his group are such that they are not susceptible to change as a result of legal enactment, administrative rules, or judicial decisions. Though caste has ceased to be a unit administering justice, yet it has not lost its hold on its individual members, who still continue to be controlled by the opinion of the caste. The picture of the control of an individual's activities by his caste, given in 1925 by an eminent social worker of Gujarat, convinces one, by its close similarity with my description of caste of about the middle of the nineteenth century, that as regards at least this aspect of caste, there has been almost no change during the course of three-quarters of a century. She observes: "On our side of the country, I mean in Gujarat, the greatest hindrance to all social reforms is the caste. If I want to educate my girl, the caste would step in and say you should not do it. If I wish to postpone my children's marriage till they are sufficiently grown up, the caste would raise its hand and forbid me. If a widow chooses to marry again and settle respectably in her home the caste would threaten to ostracize her. If a young man wishes to go to Europe for bettering his own or the country's prospects, the caste would, though perhaps nowadays give him a hearty send-off, yet close its doors on him when he returns. If a respectable man of the so-considered Untouchable class is invited to a house, the caste would deliver its judgement against that householder and condemn him as unfit for any intercourse."[29]

It must have become clear by now that the activities of the British Government have gone very little towards the solution of the problem of caste. Most of these activities, as must be evident, were dictated by prudence of administration

and not by a desire to reduce the rigidity of caste, whose disadvantages were so patent to them. The most important step they have taken is the recent regulation in some of the Provinces that a definite percentage of posts in the various services shall be filled from the members of the non-Brahmin or the intermediate castes, provided they have the minimum qualifications. This was originally the demand of the leaders of the non-Brahmin movement. And it is the most obvious remedy against caste-domination. But the obvious is not necessarily the wisest. I contend that the restriction on the numbers of the able members of the Brahmin and the allied castes, imposed by this resolution of the Government, penalizes some able persons simply because they happen to belong to particular castes. When in the case of certain services recruited by means of competitive examinations, some vacancies are offered to candidates who have failed to attain a particular rank in the examination, on the ground that they belong to certain castes, which must be represented in the higher services of the country, it clearly implies that even the accepted standard of qualifications and efficiency is abandoned. The result has been the pampering of caste even at the cost of efficiency and justice. The Government of Bombay, in their memorandum submitted to the Indian Statutory Commission, 1928 (p. 94), complain that the District School Boards, where the non-Brahmins have had a majority, "have almost in every case attempted to oust the Brahmins regardless of all consideration of efficiency." Yet this action is only a logical development of the attitude of the Government which nursed, rather than ignored, the spirit of caste.

On the whole, the British rulers of India, who have throughout professed to be the trustees of the welfare of the country, never seem to have given much thought to the problem of caste, in so far as it affects the nationhood of India. Nor have they shown willingness to take a bold step rendering caste innocuous. Their measures generally have been promulgated piecemeal and with due regard to the safety of British domination.

It may be argued that, if the British masters of India did not take any comprehensive steps to minimize the evil effects of caste which they openly deplored, it must be said to their credit that they did not at least consciously foster the institution. But in the face of the utterances of some responsible British officers, after the Rising of 1857 was quelled, it is not possible to endorse this view. The Rising opened the eyes of the administrators of the country as well as of the students of British Indian history to the potentialities of caste. It was almost the unanimous opinion of persons connected with the Government of India that the deep causes of the Rising were to be found in the fact that the Bengal Army was composed largely of the higher castes, viz. the Brahmins and the Rajputs. The special Commission presided over by Lord Peel, which was appointed to suggest a reorganization of the Indian Army, took evidence from many high officials who were sometime or other closely connected with India. Lord Elphinstone opined that it was desirable that men of different castes should be enlisted in the Army, while Major-General H. T. Tucker went further and insisted on the necessity of keeping the country under British domination through the policy of dividing and separating into distinct bodies the nationalties and castes recruited to the Army. Such being the general tenor of the main bulk of evidence the Commission recommended that "The Native Indian army should be composed of different nationalities and castes and as a general rule mixed promiscuously through each regiment". Lord Ellenborough advised the same, but clearly pointed out that the recommendation was based solely on the ground of British interests and not on the consideration of efficiency of the Army. He lamented the fact that if the suggested procedure were adopted "we must abandon the hope of ever again seeing a native army composed like that we have lost. It was an army which, under a General that it loved and trusted, would have marched victorious to the Dardanelles."[30] Ever since then the Indian Army has been studiously purged of the higher castes. The lesson of the Rising, viz. that the safety of the British domination in India was very closely connected with keeping the Indian people divided on the lines of caste, was driven home

to the British rulers. Some officials like Sir Lepel Griffin thought that caste was useful in preventing rebellion,[31] while James Kerr, the Principal of the Hindu College at Calcutta, wrote the following in 1865: "It may be doubted if the existence of caste is on the whole unfavourable to the permanence of our rule. It may even be considered favourable to it, provided we act with prudence and forbearance. Its spirit is opposed to national union."[32] The maxim of "divide and rule" began to be preached by historians and journalists alike.[33] Because the Rising was largely the work of soldiers of the high castes of Brahmins and Rajputs, there was a clamour in England that the high-caste sepoys should be exterminated.[34] Suspicion of high castes therefore dates from the Rising. The valuable lesson so dearly purchased was not going to be lost. It being repeated in the form of the general principle of "divide and rule" could not have failed to influence the policy and conduct of later officials. It is well to remember in this connection that even the Roman Church, in its desire to propagate its faith, was prepared to accommodate caste in its practical programme, though it was opposed to the humanitarian principles of the Church. Pope Gregory XV published a bull sanctioning caste regulations in the Christian Churches of India.[35]

The British brought with them a casteless culture and a literature full of thoughts on individual liberty. With the introduction of English education many of the intelligent minds of the country came in closer contact with the religion of the rulers and with some outstanding personalities amongst them. As a result some Indians like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Devendranath Tagore started movements, which aimed at liberalizing religion and practising the brotherhood of man. The Brahmo Samaj had not only monotheism to preach but also to establish a brotherhood wherein man shall not be divided from man because of caste. The Bombay Prarthana Samaj, inspired by the ideals of Brahmo Samaj in Bengal, has also thrown caste overboard as far as its tenets go. While this movement of repudiating caste was being fostered, other capable Hindu minds thought of remodelling Hindu society

after the pristine ideals supposed to be enshrined in the Vedas. Swami Dayanand preached that the four-fold division of the Hindu people should be substituted for the manifold ramifications of contemporary caste. The one important innovation that this school of thought carried out in its programme of reconstruction was that even the fourth class of the Hindu society, viz. the Śūdras, could study the Vedas.[36] Viewing both these movements as an outsider one cannot but be impressed by the manifest success of the Arya Samaj movement of Swami Dayananda. Speaking of the Prarthana Samaj of Bombay, it will be very hard to point out examples from among its high-caste leaders, who, when they had to arrange for the marriages of their sons or daughters, made any effort to practise the ideal they preached. Nay, some of the eminent leaders of the Samaj while openly denouncing caste, busied themselves with the affairs of the caste-groups in which they were born. The situation demonstrates the tenacious reality of caste, which was long ago stated in the apt Tamil proverb, "even an ascetic is not free from love for his caste". The greater popularity of the Arya Samaj, compared with that of the Prarthana Samaj, is due to the following reasons: First, the Arya Samaj tried to revive the ancient purity of the Vedic society and thus appealed to the traditional sentiment of the people; secondly, the sincerity of the members of the Arya Samaj was much better demonstrated in actual practice; and thirdly, its chief centre of activity was transferred to the Panjab, where caste has been flexible.

Movements against caste of a more militant nature were not slow to arise. In 1873 Jyotirao Phooley of Poona, though a man of Mali caste and of camparatively little education, started an association of members called the Satyashodhak Samaj with the purpose of asserting the worth of man irrespective of caste. The breadth of his vision and the extent of his reforming activities led him to proclaim in his books and to carry out in his practice a revolt against the tyranny of the caste-system. He exhorted the non-Brahmin castes not to engage any Brahmin priest to conduct their marriage ritual, which he tried to reduce to a very simple procedure. He had

perceived the necessity of educating the class of people to whom his appeal was directed, and had started primary schools both for boys and girls of the non-Brahmin castes as early as 1848. The catholicity of his mind is further proved by the fact that Phooley started in 1851, a primary school for the so-called untouchables in Poona, the very centre of orthodoxy, where, only fifty years before that, persons of these castes could not even move about during the best part of the day.

Phooley's was a revolt against caste in so far as caste denied ordinary human rights to all the members of Hindu society, and not merely a non-Brahmin movement to cast off the domination of the Brahmins. In his writings he demanded representation for all classes of the Hindus in all the local bodies, the services, and the institutions.[37] The movement did not receive any support from the Brahmins in general. Only stray individuals like Ranade showed sympathy with it. Even among the non-Brahmins the progress of Phooley's ideas was slow. It was the late Maharaja of Kolhapur who infused new life into the agitation, so much so that Montague and Chelmsford, in their Indian political reforms, had to grant the demands.[38]

It would be interesting to know the ideas of the late Maharaja of Kolhapur, who did so much for the recognition of the non-Brahmin movement. On the eve of the announcement of the Indian reforms he said: "If castes remain as they are, Home Rule in the sense it is meant will result in nothing but a kind of oligarchy. This of course does not mean, I may tell once more, that I am against Home Rule. Surely we want it. Under the present circumstances, however, we must have the protection and guidance of the British Government until the evil of caste-system becomes ineffective. To prevent Home Rule from culminating in oligarchy, we must have communal representation at least for ten years. It will teach us what our rights are. Once we know them, communal representation can be dispensed with."[39]

The purpose for which this staunch advocate of the non-

Brahmin movement urged communal representation is by now more than achieved. An analysis of the membership of the various local bodies in the presidencies of Bombay and Madras clearly proves that the non-Brahmins know their rights and are generally keen to conduct a strong campaign against any measure which they feel unjust to them. A number of motions tabled and questions asked in the Bombay Legislative Council tell the same story.[40] The activity of a Madras association of non-Brahmins and handicraftsmen further illustrates this. One Brahmin member of the Government of Madras during Lord Pentland's tenure issued an order that the Vishwakarmans—handicraftsmen—must not suffix the word "Achary" to their names but that they must continue to use the traditional word "Asary". The said association memorialized to the Governor, as the word "Asary" carried some odium in the eyes of the people, protesting against the order, which they described as a stab in the dark. Not being able to move the Governor to cancel the order they sent a petition to the Secretary of State.[41]

Rao Bahadur A.B. Latthe, the biographer of the late Maharaja of Kolhapur, evidently realizing that the case for special representation cannot be sanctioned on the plea urged by his late hero, seeks other grounds—grounds that one knowing Indian conditions is sure to declare as likely to continue for at least a few generations—to support a worse form of special representation. He observes, "Unless, among the Hindus, caste disappears altogether, there is little chance of avoiding political expedients, like communal electorates though their harmful results are obvious."[42]

There are other leaders of the non-Brahmins who are at pains to proclaim that their movement, including their insistence on strict reservation of posts in the various services, is not inspired by any anti-Brahmin feeling. Others again assert that the large class of taxpayers represented by the non-Brahmin classes must have an adequate share of state-support in the form of reserved posts.

The logic of these arguments is transparent, and opposed to the accepted criteria of nationality and the guiding principles of social justice. Nevertheless only a microscopic minority, even of the small number that recognizes the evils of these demands, propounds that communalism must be abandoned. The Chairman of the Reception Committee of the meeting of the Madras non-Brahmin party in 1924 made a strong appeal "to abandon the communal policy pursued hitherto and transform the party into an organization representing the forces working for reform along constitutional lines into which everyone without distinction of caste, religion, or colour would have free admission".[43] The party did not accept this wholesome principle of development until late in 1930.

What are the interests which the leaders of the non-Brahmin movement wish to safeguard by means of special representation? If there are any such interests, are they identical for all the castes that are officially included in the category of non-Brahmins? These are questions which it is not at all easy for the protagonists of the movement to answer. The economic interests of the artisans, the tenant-farmers, land-lords, and mill-workers are not identical. All these are very well represented in the non-Brahmin group. Nor has there been any attempt, to my knowledge, on the part of the Brahmins during recent times to penalize these classes of people simply because of caste-feelings. If any such legislation were introduced the British element in the Government of the country could effectively checkmate it.

The non-Brahmin castes can be regarded as one group only in social matters because the attitude of the Brahmins as regards food and social intercourse, and religious instruction and ministration towards them, has been uniform. There has been enough awakening in the country for the Brahmins not to try the dangerous path of imposing legal restrictions in these matters. Even the Tamil Nad Congress Committee decided in 1925 that "the gradation of merit based on birth should not be observed in Indian social life."[44] Whatever liberalizing of

the Brahmin attitude in this respect has taken place during the last forty years is mainly due to education and social reform campaign and not to the very recent reserved or communal representation.

Reserved representation is thus not necessary. Nay, it is harmful in so far as it tends to perpetuate the distinction based on birth. Co-operation in the satisfaction of the needs of common social life through the machinery of Government is one of the potent factors that have dissolved tribal bonds and created nation-communities. This co-operation may be based on both territorial contiguity and affinity of interests. Special representation for some castes, which have, as shown above, interests that are neither common to them, nor necessarily conflicting with the interests of other castes, means the negation of such co-operation. In countries where the nation-community is strongly built up on the basis of the feeling of the unity no such principle is recognized for the representation of the different interests, even when they can be parcelled out into groups with conflicting interests. Thus we have not heard of "labour" claiming special representation in the British Parliament. Where it is a question of engendering a feeling of unity the people must be made to co-operate irrespective of their caste. It is only by such activity that the feeling of nation-community can be created. To harp on the caste-differences and to allow special representation is to set at naught the fundamental condition for the rise of community feeling.

Certain types of non-Brahmin leaders find[45] it easy to secure a seat on the legislature or a local body through the door of reserved representation, and that is the main reason, perhaps, why they are so strong in claiming it. But they fail to see that their example would be soon followed by many of the large castes that comprise at present the non-Brahmin category and their chances of an easy seat would be very much diminished. That this is not mere imagination will be clear to anyone who has followed the history of the demand for special representation in Indian political life. Ere long

we shall witness the situation of many different castes that are individually large enough, each clamouring for special representation.[46] National life will thus be reduced to an absurdity. As it is, the non-Brahmins in the Bombay Presidency, wherever they could have their way, have shown unmistakable tendency to be anti-Brahmin and to harass their Brahmin employees in the matter of transfers, etc.[47] Perhaps, in the name of justice and efficiency, the time has come when the interests of the Brahmins have to be protected against the majority-party. All points considered, special representation is unnecessary and harmful.

It has been mentioned above that the other demand of the non-Brahmins, which is already granted, is reservation of posts in the various services. This feature has latterly been so far insisted upon by the party that a journalist of long standing recently described it as "immediately and on the surface a movement to secure a larger share of offices in the administration".[48] The principle is also liable, like representation, to be reduced to absurdity by separate demands by individual castes, officially forming the non-Brahmin group. There are the clearest indications of this development in the nearest future. Not long after the declaration of this policy by the Madras Government it was faced with this situation. "The hundreds of small communities into which Indian society is divided were not slow to take advantage of the opportunity which was so conveniently afforded them, and began to clamour for special representation in the Legislature, local bodies, the public services and even educational institutions. The Government, in which also the non-Brahmin element was very influential, tried to satisfy the ever-increasing demand for the plums of office, but naturally could not succeed. It created jealousies and enmities which have now reacted with disastrous effect on the party."[49]

The ground on which reservation of posts can be supported are two. First, that the Brahmins and other castes, which have a very strong majority in the personnel of the services, can and do harass the populace simply because they are non-

Brahmins. Second, that in the selection for fresh vacancies the dominant castes make it impossible for the non-Brahmins to get the posts. The former allegation is sometimes made, but our experience does not lead us to belive that such harassment exists on an appreciable scale. Even if it did exist, there is enough general awakening to bring the offenders to book. Caste feeling being what it is, it is very likely that strong bias in favour of one's caste-fellows leads many to prefer them or to use influence in their favour to the detriment of the non-Brahmins or other castes. If proper precaution can be taken against such a contingency, there would be no scope for the vicious principle of the reservation of posts. Such precaution, it appears to me, can be effectively taken if all the recruitment to all the public services is made on the results of competitive examinations held by a board consisting of persons well-known for their liberal and castelesss views.

The problem of the depressed classes, in so far as it is the result of the caste system, deserves special treatment. Among these classes are castes that follow the skilled occupations of tanning, shoe-making, and working in bamboo and cane. These are considered so low by the other Hindus that, as pointed out before, they were not allowed to approach other castes within a measurable distance. They have thus been segregated most effectively for centuries. Their ideas of cleanliness have lagged very far behind those of caste-Hindus. Education has never been a luxury enjoyed by them. Utterly despised by the higher sections of society they have had no incentive to imitate them. Those who feel that the inhuman treatment of these very useful classes of society is wrong realize that a change in it depends as much upon reform in the habits of these classes as upon a change in the attitude of the caste-Hindus. To alter the habits of these people education, both through teaching and propaganda, is essential. Some aspects of these habits also depend on the economic position of these classes. To better the economic position of the depressed classes is thus necessary in order to bring about a real change in their social status.

In the Maratha region since the time of Jyotirao Phooley, all reformers who have felt the injustice of the situation have begun their campaign with provision for the education of the members of the depressed classes.

Individual workers like Messrs. V. R. Shinde and A. V. Thakkar have done much not only to rouse the feeling of the caste-Hindus against the unjust doctrine of untouchability but also to prepare the depressed classes for better treatment by spreading education amongst them. The problem of the removal of untouchability is now made a national one through the efforts of Mahatma Gandhi. I have already dealt with the liberalizing consequences of certain administrative aspects of the British rule. The campaign has, in no small measure, benefited by the efforts made by Christian and Muhammadan missionaries to convert the depressed classes to their faiths. The more reasonable section of the high-caste Hindus have sensed a real danger to their faith in allowing their doctrine of untouchability to drive away into the folds of other faiths members of the untouchable castes, members who have been quite good and devout Hindus.

The result of this many-sided attack is to be seen in the change of viewpoint of many a member of the higher castes. Incidents like the following one from Bengal are more and more to be witnessed. "Kulin Brahmins of Nabadwip, Shantipur, Krishnagar, Kustia and other places accepted and drank water from the hands of Namashudras, washermen, boatmen, dais, and other untouchables and drank the water amidst scenes of great enthusiasm. Young Brahmins and old Bhattacharyas, Mukherjis, Banerjis, Chatterjis, Maitras, all took part in the interesting function."[50] In their determined effort to pass through the roads of Vaikam in Travancore in 1924, which were, in the caste regime prohibited to the untouchables, these latter were helped by many a high-caste Hindu. While the trustees of Hindu temples, taking shelter behind certain decisions of the Privy Council of doubtful applicability, have closed the temple doors to the untouchables, individual owners of private temples have allowed free access for all classes of

Hindus to the temples under their management. This is not to say that there is no organized effort to combat the spread of the doctrine of anti-untouchability. In the beginning of 1925 a number of merchants of Bombay, among whom were included some of the leading public men, convened a meeting of orthodox Hindus. Almost every speaker denounced what they called the heresies of Gandhi in respect of untouchability, and declared that the Hindu religion was in danger at his hands.[51] It is more or less clear that the conflict will last for some time to come, and it is the duty of those who have no belief in untouchability to preach its abolition and to demonstrate their belief through their own conduct.

Such being the attitude of high-caste Hindus in general, there is much justification for demanding some representation for the untouchable classes in the local and legislative bodies. The classes, ground down by age-long tradition, have not yet produced a sufficient number of men who can organize them to take care of their rights by public agitation. I have remarked that a large part of the problem of the removal of untouchability centres round the habits and customs of the untouchable castes. Education of these classes is a crying necessity. Poverty and established practice conspire to make them shun education. Under the circumstances a liberal system of stipends for their members at all stages of education is highly desirable.

The growth of city life with its migratory population has given rise to hotels and restaurants. The exigencies of office work have forced city people to put aside their old ideas of purity. Caste-Hindus have to eat articles of food prepared by Christians, Musalmans, or Persians, because Hindu restaurants have not been easily or equally accessible during office hours. In Hindu hotels, they have to take their meals in the company of people of almost any caste—as the hotel-keeper cannot manage to reserve accommodation for members of different castes. What was originally done under pressure of necessity has become a matter of routine with many in their city life. This freedom from caste-restrictions about food,

though seen in the city, is a mere garb that is usually cast aside by city people when they go to their villages. The force of custom and sentiment is so great that it has led the people to create a dual standard of life rather than break with their village folk. Especially is this true of all formal occasions. While this slow and enforced change was taking place special dinners whereat persons sit in a row irrespective of caste have, from time to time, been successfully arranged by some associations. Conscious effort and the force of flux have effected an altogether healthy and appreciable modification in the people's attitude in the matter of supposed pollution imparted through food and drink by certain classes of people. Whereas in Poona a handful of people like M. G. Ranade and others were subjected to social tyranny and ultimately forced to undergo expiratory rites in 1891-2 for having taken tea at a Christian missionary's place, today no one even takes notice of the Brahmins dining at the Government House.

In those parts of India, where the untouchables were really unapproachable, certain exigencies of modern life have forced high-cate Hindus to change their attitude and practice to some extent. "In towns, where private scavenging and sweeping are enforced, the scavengers and sweepers have not only to go near the houses but have sometimes to enter into them for scavenging. This has done away with distance pollution".[52]

There is much more freedom in the matter of choice of occupation today than under the old regime. First, new occupations, which require abilities similar to those displayed in older occupation, have arisen out of the new requirements. Many of these occupations, like those of draftsmanship and cabinet-making, have come to be booked upon with greater esteem and are better remunerated than their older prototypes. Draftsmanship is partially allied to clerkship (in so far as it involves desk-work in an office) and largely to the ancient designer's avocation. Recruits to this profession, therefore, hail both from the higher castes of Brahmins and others as well as from the lower castes, such as higher

artisans. Such occupations as tailoring and shoemaking have appreciated in public esteem partly because of the new machinery making them easy and less tedious, and largely because the new technique and craftsmanship is associated with the new rulers. They are, therefore, taken up by more and more members of very high castes. Secondly, dislocation of the old economic order and provision of facilities for training in arts and crafts have led to an extensive shifting of the old lines of division between occupations. The total result is that at present many members of the Brahmin caste are seen engaged in almost any of the occupations, excepting those of casual labourer, sweeper, and scavenger. Many members of the various artisan castes are teachers, shopkeepers, bank clerks, shop assistants, and architects.

In the textile mills of Bombay not a few members of even the untouchable castes have found work quite different from what they were used to under the regime of caste. Whatever restrictions caste imposed on the choice of occupation have largely ceased to guide individuals, and it is ignorance and lack of enterprise that have kept the occupational unfreedom of caste, even to the extent that it is observed, and not the old ideas of what was considered to be one's traditional or hereditary occupation.

The endogamous nature of caste has remained almost the same with this difference that whereas formerly marriage outside one's caste was not to be even thought of, today many educated young men and women are prepared to break through the bonds of caste if mutual love or attraction demands it. In Bombay I have known many examples, mostly members of younger generation, who have managed their own matrimonial affairs, the parties to which belong to two different castes. A large majority of such marriages, known as inter-caste or mixed marriages, is formed by couples where the female partner belongs to a caste lower than that of the male partner. Yet the opposite variety, where the male partner belongs to a lower caste, is not altogether rare. As for the older generation, it may be said without exaggeration that,

in spite of the talk about social reform, it has made very little advance in its ideas on the subject of intermarriage. When, therefore, elderly persons arrange the marriages of their wards they hardly ever think of going beyond their caste—even though it be a section of a large group—from which to select a bride or a bridegroom. If they venture to ignore the limits of the narrowest division—if for example a Chitpavan Brahmin selects a girl from the Karhada Brahmin caste for his son, in the Maratha country—he is looked up to as a reformer. It would be hard to point out examples of marriages between members of outright separate castes arranged for their wards by the elderly guardians. It is the recklessness and enthusiasm of youth alone that is prepared to transgress the bounds of castes for the purpose of marriage.

When the city of Bombay began to attract large numbers of people from rural areas, the immigrants, with their traditions of caste, began to congregate, as far as possible according to their castes, though the village affinity influencing the place of residence, modified this tendency. The Brahmin castes of the Maratha country are mostly vegetarians, while the other castes are usually non-vegetarians. The Brahmins had the additional motives of escaping bad odours given out by fish and flesh when they are being dressed, to try to live together in buildings where only Brahmins dwelt. This tendency for every large caste to live in isolation from other castes has been steadily growing during the last twenty years. It will be observed that this desire is only the old caste practice of reserving special parts of the village for the different castes moulded to suit the changed conditions of city life. The inclination of the people was encouraged and aggravated by private charity expressing itself through the channels of caste. With the quickening of caste-consciousness and the fostering of caste-patriotism, philanthropic persons have been building houses and chawls to be rented only to their caste-members at moderate rents. Charity, intending to further the educational interests of a caste, has found expression also in providing free hostels to the student members of the caste. As a result, in those areas of Bombay which are largely

inhabited by the middle classes, we find today whole chawls which are occupied by members of one or two castes with close affinity, whole buildings rented at moderate or even nominal rents only to the members of a particular caste, and hostels giving free accommodation to the students of a particular caste. Buildings meant for members of a particular caste generally bear prominent boards blatantly announcing the fact of their reservation and where it is a case of individual endowment also the name of the philanthropic donor. Even the colleges and the University are infested with endowments from which scholarships are to be paid to students of certain specified castes.

The introduction of co-operative schemes of amelioration have afforded another opportunity for caste-solidarity to manifest itself. Co-operative housing more than any other aspect of co-operative undertaking, has appealed to the caste-spirit, though credit societies of individual castes, like that of the Reddis, are not altogether unknown. In fact it would be true to remark that only those co-operative housing societies have succeeded most which have restricted their membership to their caste-fellows. Even in business this tendency to restrict the holding of shares to the members of a particular caste is sometimes apparent. Recently, the Brahmins of Madras started a fund called the "Triplicane Fund", shares in which could be held only by Brahmins. Those responsible for starting it included gentlemen of "culture, education, and learning". "Such being the case, we regret that one of the rules of the Fund is so narrowly conceived as to exclude all that are not Brahmins from the right of holding shares. It is just this type of exclusiveness that furnishes interested parties like the ministerialists their best nutriment. Those who decry the excesses of communalism should themselves first set the example of a healthy, wholesome, non-communal outlook in the practical affairs of life".[53]

One feature of Hindu society during the last thirty or forty years has been the marked tendency for every caste to form its own association comprising all members of the caste

speaking the same language[53a] In the old regime the caste-panchayat or council was usually restricted to the confines of the village or the town. Barely, if at all, did the jurisdiction of the council, in the case of the majority of the castes, extend beyond these limits. "In the large majority of cases, the caste-consciousness is limited by the bounds of the village and its organizations do not extend beyond the village area".[54] The functions of these new organizations are: (1) to further the general interests of the caste and particularly to guard its social status in the hierarchy from actual or potential attacks of other castes; (2) to start funds to provide student-ships for the needy and deserving students of the caste, usually at the secondary and college stage of education, and sometimes even to help them to proceed to foreign countries for higher academic qualification; (3) to help poor people of the caste; (4) and sometimes to try to regulate certain customs of the caste by resolutions passed at the annual meeting of the members of the caste. All these objects, excepting perhaps that of providing studentships, were used to be achieved, in a great or a small measure, by an arrangement not always permanent. Sometimes an *ad hoc* committee would take up the work and carry it out. I have already referred to the stubborn opposition of the Kammalans of Madras to the supreme position of the Brahmins in the hierarchy. The Kayasth Prabhus of Poona and many other castes of the Maratha country protested from time to time to the court of the Peshwa against certain restrictions which other castes professed to enforce upon them to stamp their status as low. Surely some elderly persons of the particular caste must have volunteered to put its case before the proper tribunal. Relief of the poor was not usually a duty undertaken by a caste. When a caste decided to apply some of its funds to charitable purposes, it handed over the money to the local priest to be used by him for benevolent purposes. The ruling ideals of the time led people to distribute charity in particular channels. The ideal was rather to build temples and rest-houses, dig wells and tanks, and to endow free feeding at the temples for a certain number of Brahmins and at the public feeding houses for travellers and others in need. All this direction

of charity was most often preached and accepted without reference to caste. Only the artisan castes, which had strong guild-like organizations, had some standing provision for helping the indigent among its members.[55] Occasionally a caste would relieve its own poor by feeding them through the headman. The funds for this purpose were available from the residue of the fines imposed on the defaulting members of the caste.[56]

We have noticed above that the Brahmins of South India assembled the Brahmins of four quarters and decided to put a stop to the practice of taking money for a bride prevailing among them. The oil-mongers of Kanchi proposed to bind themselves by certain conditions about donations to temples and to observe them as "jātidharma", i.e. duty which every member owed to his caste.[57]

The community-aspect of caste has thus been made more comprehensive, extensive, and permanent. More and more of an individual's interests are being catered for by caste, and the needy who are helped by their castefunds naturally owe much to their caste and later in life look upon it with feelings of gratitude and pride. They feel it their proud duty to strengthen the caste-organization, remembering their obligations to it. Thus a vicious circle has been created. The feeling of caste-solidarity is now so strong that it is truly described as caste-patriotism.

From the discussion of the non-Brahmin and depressed class movements it will be evident that the old hierarchy of caste is no longer acquiesced in. Many are the castes that employ priests of their own caste. Some of the castes, the goldsmiths of the Maratha country, for example, have already started asserting their dignity by refusing to take food at the hands of castes, other than the Brahmin, which according to their old practice do not reciprocate that courtesy. In this process it is the lower caste that starts the movement in order to raise its own status. To add to this the old profession of a teacher, and the more or less new profession of a Govern-

ment clerk, are coveted by many more castes than was the practice in the old regime. There is a veritable scramble for these petty jobs. Conflict of claims and opposition has thus replaced the old harmony of demand and acceptance. The contrast in the old and new situation is vividly brought out in the description of village conditions in a part of the Madras Presidency existing more than a century ago and those subsisting ten years ago. A report on the state of the village in 1808 contains the following: "Every village with its twelve 'ayagandeas', as they are denominated, is a petty commonwealth, with the 'mocuddim', 'potail' 'kapoo', 'reddy', or chief inhabitant, at the head of it; and India is a great assemblage of such commonwealths. While the village remains entire, they care not to what power it is transferred".[57] The District Gazetteer of Tinnevelly, on the other hand, had to record in 1917 the following: "With all the inducements to co-operation it can scarcely be said that the average Tinnevelly village possesses the strength born of unity. General Panchayats are practically unknown, disputes are too readily taken to the lawcourts instead of being settled in the village, and the best efforts of the revenue and irrigation officers and of the police are often hampered by deep-seated faction. It is among the individual castes that the spirit of cohesion is most clearly seen. This often takes the practical form of a 'Mahimai', or general fund, levied by each community for its own use. . . . The objects of expenditure are usually the support of temples, mosques, or churches owned by the contributors; occasionally the money is diverted to petitions or litigation in which the caste as a whole is interested."[58] Caste-solidarity has taken the place of village-community.

To sum up, social and religious privileges and disabilities born of caste are no longer[59] recognised in law and only partially in custom. Only the depressed classes are labouring under certain customary and semi-legal disabilities. Caste no longer rigidly determines as individual's occupation, but continues to prescribe almost in its old rigour the circle into which one has to marry. One has still to depend very largely on one's caste for help at critical periods of one's life, like marriage

and death. One's closest companions and friends are mainly delimited by the circle of one's caste. The difference between the old regime and contemporary society lies in this that whereas under the ancient organization the facts mentioned above were almost universally true, today there is a section of society—the modernly educated persons—small yet important, which has risen above all these restrictions. They are bound to serve as beaconlights to the wavering members of society. Attitudes of exclusiveness and distrust, enshrined in the old vernacular proverbs, between caste and caste, still persevere even in the minds of the educated. Caste-associations are very common and command the services of even the most highly educated persons to further their object of helping the members of their castes. As long as endogamy is prescribed and practised, wider self-interest dictates that one should help the aggrandisement of the members of one's caste. For, the better the economic prospects for the youths of the caste the greater the chances of getting well-to-do husbands for one's daughters. The rule of endogamy is in a way the fundamental factor of contemporary caste.

Caste has thus become the centre of an individual's altruistic impulse and philanthropic activities. The existence of definite organization has rallied round the caste the feelings of consciousness of kind. In the desire to help one's caste-fellows many forget the principles of social justice, and are led to do, consciously or otherwise, injustice to the members of other castes. Unfortunately many leaders in civic life are associated with the movement of amelioration of their respective castes. The mental undercurrents of those who are to be led breathe distrust of such leaders. The conduct of these leaders in the matter of the marriages of their wards usually in their own caste—strengthens this lack of confidence felt by the populace, and acts as a buttress against the attacks on caste-endogamy. Hardly any caste accepts its accredited status or concedes the precedence of another caste, though it may demand such precedence of a caste supposed to be lower than it in the old hierarchy.

Economic conditions have led many castes to clamour for petty jobs in the clerical line. This factor enhances the feeling of caste-animosity. Even the apex of the ancient scheme, the priesthood of the Brahmin, which has been, with one or two exceptions, the great bond of social solidarity in this finely divided society, is being loosened by caste after caste. Contemporary caste-society presents the spectacle of self-centred groups more or less in conflict with one another.

1. Kikani, p. iii.
2. Kikani, p. 7.
3. Kikani, p. iii.
4. Kikani, p. 132.
5. Ibid., p. xii.
6. Mayne, pp. 779-82.
7. Mandlik, p. 430.
8. *The Times of India* (Bombay), 30th June 1928
9. Kikani, p. vi.
10. Latthe, vol. ii. p. 373.
11. Mayne, pp. 108-9.
12. *The Legislative Assembly Debates*, vol. iii, pp. 3899-926.
13. *The Bombay Chronicle*, 31st March, 1924.
    N.B.: John Wilson wrote in 1877: "Few, if any, of the Antyaja are found in Government schools. This is to be ascribed not only to the Brahmanical fear of contamination and the general caste prejudices of the people, but to the want of firmness on the part of the Government educational authorities as has been the case in some instances of the agents of the missionary bodies."
    (*Indian Caste*, vol. ii, p. 45.)
14. *Forward* (Calcutta), 7th November, 1923.
15. *Bombay Chronicle*, 1st May, 1925.
16. *Memorandum submitted by the Government of Bombay to the Indian Statutory Commission, 1928.* (1929), p. 228.
17. Ibid., p. 44.
18. This resolution was modified by a later one, dated 5th February, 1925, wherein the absolute restriction on the recruitment from the advanced classes was removed.
19. See notices by the Dean of the Grant Medical College and the Principal of the Gujarat College in *The Times of India*, 26th April, 1926.
20. G.I.P. Railway Risk-note. Form "B" B.I.P.—176-9-24-30000.
21. See Kitts, p. 1.
22. *India Census*, 1901, pp. 537-8.
23. *Bengal Census*, 1921, p. 346.
24. *Madras Census*, 1911, p. 178.

25. During the recent (1928-30) Civil Disobedience movement the influence of caste was clearly visible in Gujarat.
26. *Panjab Census*, 1921, pp. 434-4. The last remark of Mr. Middleton appears to me to be an overstatement even in the case of the Panjab, where caste has been more fluid than elsewhere in India.
27. N.B.: I am glad to note that as a result of the agitation carried on by the Jat-Pat-Torak Mandal of Lahore the Government of India made some concession in the matter of the filling in of the column for caste at the Census of 1931 in the case of persons who do not conform to the practices of their caste.
28. Compare J. Murdoch, *Caste*, (1887), pp. 38-42, and also the quotation from Sherring therein; and Rev. John Morrison, *New Ideas in India*, (1906), p. 33.
29. Lady Vidyagauri Ramanbhai as reported in the *Indian Social Reformer* (Bombay), 5th September, 1925.
30. *Report of the Peel Commission on the Organization of the Indian Army*, 1859, p. 14, and Appendix, pp. 6, 10, 147.
31. Vide Murdoch, *Caste*, p. 43.
32. Kerr, p. 361, footnote.
33. L. J. Trotter, *History of India under Queen Victoria*, vol. ii, (1886), p. 91, and *The Times of India*, 3rd July, 1897 (leading article).
34. Edward Sullivan, *Letters on India*, (1858), pp. 124-5.
35. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Ed., vol. v, p. 468 (a).
36. See the account of the Arya Samaj given by Pandit Harikishan Kaul in the *Panjab Census Report*, 1911, pp. 133-6.
37. Phooley, pp. 25, 33, 59, 63.
38. This demand for representation in the services was first made in a petition addressed by the artisan castes of Madras to the Board of Revenue in 1840. "All classes of men, to the destruction of Brahmanical monopoly, should be appointed to public offices without distinction." John Wilson, *Indian Caste*, vol. ii, p. 89, footnote.
39. Latthe, vol. ii. p. 494.
40. *Memorandum submitted by the Government of Bombay to the Indian Statutory Commission*, 1928, pp. 527-9.
41. *The Times of India* (Bombay), 25th October, 1924.
42. *The Indian Social Reformer* (Bombay), 3rd January, 1925.
43. *The Indian Daily Mail* (Bombay), 14th October, 1924.
44. *The Bombay Chronicle*, 2nd May, 1925.
45. N.B.: This was written in about 1930.
46. Between the time this was written and it appeared in print the Marwaris of Calcutta put forward a plea for special representation.
47. *Memorandum submitted by the Government of Bombay to the Indian Statutory Commission*, 1928, p. 229.
48. *Indian Social Reformer*, 11th February, 1928.
49. *The Indian Daily Mail* (Bombay), 14th October, 1924.

50. *Forward* (Calcutta), 6th March, 1924.
51. *The Times of India*, 5th January, 1925.
52. *Travancore Census*, 1921, p. 106.
53. *The Indian Social Reformer* (Bombay), 16th October, 1926.
53a. Perhaps the earliest of such organizations is the one started by a Bihar caste in 1891 (*Memorandum for the Indian Statutory Commission*, Bihar & Orissa, p. 87). By 1928 such Sabhas existed for most of the principal castes of Bihar.
54. Matthai. p. 65.
55. Ibid., pp. 65, 68-9. Even the artisan castes sometimes depended on special collections for a specific purpose. The guilds of artisans in Broach, for example, when they required funds, collected them by subscriptions among the members of the caste. (*Imperial Gazetteer of India, Provincial Series, Bombay Presidency*, vol. i, p. 312.)
56. Mookerji, p. 186.
57. The Fifth Report from the Select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company, vol. ii, (ed. 1883), p. 575.
58. *Madras District Gazetteers*: *Tinnevelly*, vol. i, 1917, p. 104.
59. N.B. Written in 1930.

9

Caste and Nationalism

We have seen that the practice of caste changed, and also that a section of the Hindus not only acquiesced in that change but actively helped it. The orthodox Hindus did not like the modifications that have come about owing to changed circumstances. They actually deprecated them, and if they had the power they would fain reinstate the old situation. The progressive elements on the other hand not only welcomed the changes but proposed further modifications. Among these there were at least three, more or less clearly distinguishable, schools of thought. There were those who believed that the best way to bring about the desired end was to hark back to the imagined pure state of Hindu society which was characterized by the existence of only the four traditional castes, viz. Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra. The greatest exponent of this point of view was Mahatma Gandhi.[1] There were others who would go ahead rather than look back on the past in the vain hope of reinstating it under totally different conditions. But they thought that the only way in which abolition of caste can be achieved as a concrete fact is, in the first place, to amalgamate the various sub-castes of a present day caste, which have much cultural unity and economic similarity. Then the castes which are approximately on a footing of equality should be consolidated, and the procedure may be followed till society becomes caste-less. They contended that this process being slow would afford sufficient time for education and the formation of informed opinion, with the necessary adjunct of the requisite mental adjustment of those classes which are not yet prepared for a wholesale change in their agelong customs. The third point of view considered caste, especially in its present form, so degrading in some of its aspects and so anti-national in others, that it would abolish it altogether without any hesi-

tation or delay.

Mahatma Gandhi did not give us a complete programme by means of which he proposed to reinstate the four old orders. It is not quite clear whether persons would be assigned to one or the other of these classes on the ground of their birth in a particular caste or on the strength of the occupation they now follow. Yet as he laid great stress on birth and heredity and subscribed to the view "one born a Brahmin always a Brahmin", he would no doubt rather rearrange the other castes into their proper groups on the basis of birth. If this procedure were sought to be put into operation I do not hesitate to state that there would be great strife among the various castes. The Kshatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra classes have not remained as distinct and intact as the Brahmins. There is much difference of opinion as to which of the castes should be included in one or the other of the above three classes. Even if an amicable settlement on this point were possible, what about the untouchable classes? Gandhi was vehemently opposed to untouchability, and he would naturally propose some respectable status for these classes. Where are they to be provided for? Wherever it may be proposed to include them, there is bound to be a tremendous protest from that class. The criterion of birth in a caste for the purposes of the proposed fourfold classification is thus found to be quite unsatisfactory. If the actual occupation of an individual is to be the test of his status, how are the modern occupations to be accommodated in this old scheme of fourfold humanity? Even if we successfully adjust the claims of all persons and classify them properly, it is an open question if marriage between the classes is to be permitted or prohibited, or if any social restrictions in the matter of food, etc., are still to continue. Altogether it appears to me that a return to the fourfold division of society is impracticable, and even if accomplished would serve no more useful purpose than that of reminding us of our past heritage.[2]

To propose to abolish caste by slow consolidation of the smaller groups into larger ones is to miss the real problem.

The method has been tried in Bombay Presidency for the last forty years and more with disastrous results. The sub-castes that join together to create a super organization retain their internal feelings of exclusiveness with undiminishing vigour. The new organization takes up a rather militant attitude against other castes, especially those which are popularly regarded as immediately higher or lower than the caste which it represents. And, as pointed out in the last chapter, caste-consciousness becomes more definite and virile. We have seen that, even among the castes which were grouped together for political purposes, the common aim of fighting other castes had not proved strong enough to induce individual castes, comprised in the group, to ignore their claims at the time of the distribution of the spoils of office. As I envisage the situation and as the analysis of caste under British rule must make it clear, the problem of caste arises mainly out of caste-patriotism. It is the spirit of caste-patriotism which engenders opposition to other castes, and creates an unhealthy atmosphere for the full growth of national consciousness. It is this caste-patriotism that we have to fight against and totally uproot. If the procedure advocated by the protagonists of the second viewpoint were to prove successful, I believe the problem of diminishing caste-patriotism will be ever so much more difficult. It would lead to three or four large groups being solidly organized for pushing the interests of each even at the cost of the others. Acute conflict will be the only consequence. Further, during this lengthy process of slow amalgamation those who will marry in defiance of the barriers of sub-caste will still be imbued with caste-mentality. The main problem will thus remain for years as acute as at present.

The above comments were written about 1931. The upsurge of Indian nationality had just gathered phenomenal force. Yet the various representations made by caste-organizations before the Government of India Act of 1935 emerged from the anvil of the British Parliament clamoured for all kinds of special attention to vociferous caste-groups. Buildings for members of one's caste were being built, co-operative banks run by specific castes were multiplying, community-

centres based on caste were being built up, maternity homes and general hospitals intended for the use of members of the specific castes were being founded in the midst of the new set-up created by the sweeping success of the Indian National Congress at the poll of 1936-37. In the political sphere only the Scheduled Castes, the erstwhile untouchables, had figured as a separate caste entity. In Bombay in addition the Marathas had managed to get some special treatment in the Constitution. The various non-Brahmin groups of the earlier era had vanished into the womb of the all-embracing Congress. Socialistic and communistic ideas of social equality and classless society were preached ever so vociferously. The World War II came in 1939. Soon thereafter the Congress intensified the national struggle.

Freedom dawned on India on the 15th August 1947. The nationalist upsurge of more than sixty years became incarnate as the nation India—Bharat. The Democratic Republican Constitution was promulgated on the 26th January 1950. Its very preamble solemnly asserts that the People of India have constituted themselves into a Sovereign Democratic Republic, which, as stated in Article 1 of the Constitution, is named "India, that is Bharat", to secure to all its citizens Justice, Liberty and Equality and to promote Fraternity. Justice is specifically described to be of three types, not only political but economic and social as well. Equality is of not only opportunity but also of status. Justice and Equality as thus defined, between them, cut the very roots of caste. Citizens of India—Bharat have avowed that the purpose of their political association is to guarantee to every citizen not only equality of opportunity, not only absence of unequal treatment in social and economic matters but also to bring about a state of social affairs in which differences of status will not exist. The fourth objective of the Nation, Fraternity, is to be as I understand it, only a consequence of the actual achievement of the first three objectives. Equality of status for individuals can exist only in a classless society and not even in a casteless one. The preamble of the Constitution of India (1950) avows a classless Indian society.

The Fundamental Rights guaranteed by the Constitution are those of Equality, Freedom, non-Exploitation, Freedom of Religion, Culture and Education, Property and Constitutional Remedies. Of these from the point of view of a student of caste the right of Equality alone is significant. In guarantee of it Article 15 states: (1) The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on the ground of caste; (2) No citizen shall, on the ground of caste, be subject to restriction regarding access to or use of shops, restaurants, and public wells and tanks and (3) The practice of untouchability is forbidden. The right of Freedom guarantees, among other things, that of practice of any lawful calling without restriction. The right of non-exploitation guarantees freedom from 'begar' and such other forms of forced labour.

The Constitution may thus be said to have abolished caste and its lingering restrictive and coercive practices and on the positive side to have proclaimed the creation of a society in which inequality of status[3]—presumably not only between groups but also between individuals—does not exist, and the promotion of fraternity.

Nevertheless certain groups in the Indian Society being in need of special attention owing to their utterly backward condition, the Constitution makes exceptions in their case and lays down the particular items. There are three classes of groups found to be in need of such special treatment. First, the so-called aborigines or the hill-tribes most of whom were formerly protected under the provisions of Excluded Areas or Scheduled Districts area-wise and not group-wise. Them I shall leave out as they cannot all be said to form part of the caste society; second, the class of groups which were formerly known as untouchables of the caste society, are now designated as Scheduled Castes. They will be dealt with in the next chapter. Third, the Constitution recognises a "backward class of citizens" (Art. 16, Cl. 4) which might require special recruitment to certain services under the State in which, it "in the opinion of the State, is not adequately represented." It lays down as one of the Directive Principles of State Policy

that "the State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people . . . . and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation". Article 338 clause (3) includes among the charge of the Special Officer for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes to be appointed by the President "such other backward classes as the President may, on receipt of the report of a Commission appointed under clause (1) of article 340, by order specify." The duties and powers of the Commission are laid down as: "to investigate the conditions of socially and educationally backward classes within the territories of India and the difficulties under which they labour and to make recommendations as to the steps that should be taken to remove such difficulties and to improve their condition" etc. The President is empowered to take whatever action he deems fit and also to issue an Order specifying the backward classes that shall be included in the category. He is required to lay before the Houses of Parliament a copy of the report and a memorandum stating the action taken.

It is clear from the contrast between the Provisions of articles 341 and 342 which govern the cases of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes on the one hand, and those of articles 338(3) and 340(3) that the Parliament has no power to do anything about the appointment of the commission, its report, the action proposed to be taken on it and the list of backward classes the President may issue. As the President has to specify the backward classes it follows that the castes or caste sections or caste groups that will be entitled to the special treatment decided upon by the President at the hands of the Special Officer contemplated in article 338 to be the caretaker of the Scheduled Tribes, the Scheduled Castes and the Backward Classes will have to be listed.

The Special Officer, who is now designated the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was appointed by the President in 1951 and the Commission under article 340 in 1953. The Report of the Backward Classes Welfare Board of Bombay State for the year 1953 contains a

list of Backward Classes specified for the State besides its Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. They number more than 125 different castes. In Madras under its Educational Rules, in July 1953 "greater facilities for education of the children and dependants of persons belonging to certain occupational communities, viz., the barber, fishermen, dhoby (washerman), and potter communities, who reside and practise their hereditary occupations in the rural areas" were announced.[4] It appears from the context that the castes enumerated were few and the conditions not entirely based on caste-qualification but occupational-cum-rural-residence one. The Bill providing for the inclusion in, and the exclusion from, the lists of Scheduled Castes and of Scheduled Tribes, of certain castes and tribes and matters connected therewith introduced in the Lok Sabha by the Union Government in April 1956 calls upon the Census authorities to collect numerical information about certain Scheduled Castes but not about any of the many castes which will be specified by the President as the Backward Classes as the latter have no special representation. But it stands to reason that though the numbers of the members of every one of the castes forming the group of Backward Classes is not necessary for political purposes yet as they will be in receipt of special treatment of all other kinds periodical reporting about their numbers is quite essential to gauge the effectiveness of the special treatment accorded to them. These castes which may number not less than three hundred, if anything like the Bombay Standard is adopted, will have to figure sooner or later in our official documents.[5]

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, the leader of the Scheduled Castes who was adamant against accepting change in the special representation of these castes in 1932 for which Mahatma Gandhi had to undertake a fast unto death, not only acquiesced in their special representation only for ten years but also became the sponsor of the constitution in 1949. A. B. Latthe who was one of the leaders of non-Brahmin movement and who in 1925 insisted on communal electorates till such time as caste disappears was prepared to forego such special repre-

sentation during the progress of the Indian Round Table Conferences in London. Pondering over the Coyajee report on Kolhapur riots of 1948 he remarked: "As an humble friend of the non-Brahmin movement of thirty years ago, I still think the movement was, essentially justified but later on it degenerated into naked communalism of several non-Brahmin communities which ultimately broke it up. . . . The vicarious punishment of all Brahmins for the sins of a few among them is foolish and hatred of one community against another is suicidal to democracy. The days of caste oligarchies have gone and cannot and ought not to be revived. Those in the State who encourage narrow communal pride . . . . are the worst enemies of the people and the State".[6] These are portents auguring well for the emergence of a casteless society. But do they really represent the social trends? Are they not merely the political veneer masking the rough fissures of caste sentiment?

There are a number of indications that the apparent improvement in caste situation in political life is very largely the result of the disappearance of the foreign power, which, as I contended in the first edition of this book in 1932, was largely responsible for the political aspect of caste. That force having ceased to operate, caste has unceremoniously shed its political mask. But its vitality in social life is as strong as ever.

In August 1950, the Government of India appointed a committee of which Shri R. R. Diwakar, the present Governor of Bihar, was the chairman, "to inquire into the question of abolition of caste and communal distinctions in Governmental activities in accordance with the Constitution". It seems the report remained confidential. One of its recommendations was that the State Governments should consider the desirability of the omission of the mention of caste in all forms and records.[7] Some proof of implementation of the pious recommendations was forthcoming in 1956 in the non-official legislation called the Indian Registration Amendment Bill which was piloted through the two Houses of Parliament by Mr. S. C. Samanta and Mr. P. T. Leuva. It renders unnecessary the recording

of caste and sub-caste of parties mentioned in a deed for registration. During the course of the debate one member, belonging to the Praja Socialist Party, suggested a wider measure making it impossible for all suffixes or prefixes signifying caste to appear anywhere. The reply of Mr. H. V. Pataskar, the Minister for Legal Affairs is worth noting as it brings out the complexity of the situation and provides justification for my statement on backward classes made above. He is reported to have said that "such legislation at the present moment would create a difficulty since the Constitution gave a special position to backward classes and scheduled castes and tribes" and to have added that "the question could be taken up after the Law Commission had submitted its report."[8] This difficulty was first put up by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Education Minister to oppose the consideration of Mr. F. B. Dabhi's Bill "to withdraw official recognition to caste distinction amongst Hindus".[9] The ambivalent attitude of the Government of the day is clearly reflected in the manner in which Mr. Pataskar opposed the amendment to a clause in the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill in the Rajya Sabha. Mr. Jaspat Roy Kapoor, a member of the Congress Party, moved a clause requiring a candidate for election to declare at the time of his nomination that he was not a member of any political organization bearing a caste or communal name or restricting its membership to one caste, community or religion. Dr. P. Subbaroyan, the well-known ex-minister of Madras State vigorously supported the amendment which was, however, lost.[10]

There is some evidence to attribute this attitude of the major political party, which is the Government of the country, to socio-political reality within it and to political expediency. In 1952 on one occasion Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stated his conviction that caste-loyalty of the Bihar Ministry had militated against efficiency and integrity in the affairs of the State and declared as the President of the Congress that persons thinking and acting on caste-basis should be expelled from the party. Within two months of the declaration in a post-election statement of thanksgiving the chief of the Congress

party in Bihar averred that to be proud of one's own caste, birth and blood in the limited sphere was not bad, but that it became bad or rather worse, when it crossed the limit! The late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel when criticised for accepting a purse from his caste in his own village is reported to have replied that by being Indian he had not ceased to be a Patidar. The Congress leaders of Saurashtra are reported to have utilized caste loyalties and animosities when Mr. Dhebar, the present President of the Congress, was the chief of the party. The use of this factor in the Andhra election of 1955 was so blatant that *The Times of India,* latterly a pro-Congress paper, came out with a leader contrasting this behaviour of the Congress High Command with its prompt action in appointing a committee after the Avadi session of the organization to suggest measures for the elimination of caste-basis.[11]

The strongest point of present day caste is restriction of marriage within it though now it is not supported by law. So far, no caste appears to have had any special arrangement to encourage and foster such marriages. Only the sentiments of the parents or guardians served the purpose. And we have seen in the preceding chapter that progressive youth was tending to step out of caste for marital partners. Colleges and hostels, where young men and women of impressionable ages, when a certain type of idealism is present, gather together had a role to play as meeting places for selection. One might have hoped that in such mixed atmosphere more and more youths would have married outside their caste. Thus an educated casteless group would have come into existence.

Perhaps the process which will bring about such a situation has begun. Here is a report of a news service agency from Mysore: "Twenty brave bachelor students of Mysore have set out to break the barriers of caste through marriage. They have vowed 'to marry out of our castes to create a casteless society within the fold of Hindu religion.' These 20 graduates and post-graduate scholars of Maharaja's College have invited boys and girls to join the matrimonial crusade against 'communal problem in India which is threatening

internal peace.' No girl has, so far, rallied under the matrimonial banner which waves over mere men now."[12] Mr. D. F. Pocock, a British anthropologist who resided and worked among Patidars of Gujarat, has recorded a loosening of the endogamous hold over these intra-caste hypergamous people. He observes[13]: "In these days when violations of caste endogamy are on the increase, although the castes in question can do little to affect the lives of the runaway members, who are usually city dwellers, such marriages can be condoned in terms of the caste hierarchy." But, at least one fairly large caste which is highly educated, whose members are very well placed in life and generally progressive, has been quick enough to sense the danger in this developing tendency to itself as a group and to caste solidarity. Five or six years ago it started a social centre for its youth, where recreation of some sort is provided, trips are organized and dramatic and elocution performances are held, in short, where young people of both sexes, who are members of the caste, can join in pleasurable activity and form acquaintanceships and friendships which ripen into marriages. Youth clubs not restricted to unmarried youths but open only to caste members, too, are coming into existence. The previous existence of caste-halls has made the concentration of caste-sociability easier.

In yet another field of integrative activity, much wider in scope and more potent in effect, has caste registered a triumph. For sometime past, as was inevitable with the formation of caste-societies and the holding of caste conferences, caste-journals had made their sporadic appearance. *The Lohana Hitechchu*, a Gujarati weekly issued by the committee of the Lohana caste in Bombay, appears to have been the earliest regular journal started by a caste for the benefit and propaganda of its members, having been published first in 1914. It has continued its publication ever since. The consciousness of this caste about itself can be judged by the fact that in its last annual conference it is reported that it collected rupees five lakhs for the purposes of caste benefit. The highly educated caste, known as Kanara Saraswat came next with its English monthly of that name started by the Kanara

Saraswat Association in 1919. Two years later the *Gujarati Samasta Lad Mitra* began its bi-monthly career in Baroda. The Marathi *Prabhu Tarun* of the Pathare Prabhu caste of Bombay City and the Gujarati *Patidar* issued by the Patidar caste from Anand, both of them monthlies, came next in 1923. The Gujarati *Anavil Pokar* issued by the Anavil Bandhu Printing Press of Surat followed next in 1926 to awaken the landlordly educated caste of South Gujarat. Twelve other journals were started by other castes before 1948. This type of caste-activity took a spurt since 1948, i.e. after the achievement of independence. Since 1948 upto the date of the publication of *Nefor Guide to Indian Publications* in 1956, twenty-five caste journals have been whipping up the sentiment of caste solidarity among the members of their respective castes.

It is interesting to note that of the forty-two caste journals listed in the publication, referred to above, only one belongs to a Bengali caste. Seven of them are conducted by castes of Maharashtra and the remaining thirty-four by Gujarati castes. Dr. K. M. Kapadia's[14] inquiry among secondary school teachers reveals that a much larger percentage of Gujarati teachers report such activity as known to them than the Maharashtrian ones. The growth and abundance of this zealous activity in combination with club and socials programmes reported by the above-mentioned investigator in Gujarat, where the Congress is believed to have the strongest hold, offers material for serious thought to the political leaders of the country!

It is well known that even in high quarters caste is a passport not only to acquaintance but also to special consideration. Here I may draw the reader's attention to a feature of Hindu social life which is calculated to strengthen caste sentiment. The ramification of ties of kinship with its consequent socially approved and morally binding rights and duties is very wide. It happens sometimes that a large number of people can claim some relationship within the approved ambit, which in practice may mean a good portion of the entire caste. The natural clientele of a man coming from an

old family and rising to the top tends to be large. The vicious circle of kin-feeling is thus wide; and caste-feeling appears as only a slight extension of kin-feeling.

The reality of caste feeling appeared in its naked form after the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi in January 1948, in India south of the Narmada generally and in Marathi speaking areas in particular. The organised incendiarism and looting was directed mainly against Brahmins and secondarily against members of the Rashtriya Svayamsevaka Sangha and of the Hindu Mahasabha. Mere horrified wrath at the dastardly murder of a revered leader is not generally held to be the effective cause of rioting directed mainly against Brahmins. It merely provided an excuse for the smouldering fire to burst out in naked conflagration. The remarks of A. B. Latthe quoted above bear up this interpretation. The occurrences proved an eye-opener to a number of slumbering leaders who soon after came out with remedies, some of which appear to me to be worse than the disease and most of which breathe the spirit of defeatism. The one lesson of far-reaching significance which the events should convey is that organizations for any group-activity, particularly for athletic and recreational activity, if they are based on caste may prove dangerous in times when reason recedes and emotion occupies the entire foreconscious of individuals and society. Most times of crises, of sudden occurrences like the death of a beloved leader and much more his murder, provide such occasions.

I have referred to the genesis of the non-Brahmin movement which first started in South India. The observation of Latthe quoted above refers to the decay of solidarity of the grouping largely as a result of the clash of similar interests of the various castes joined together for the purpose of anti-Brahmin front. I have also drawn my readers' attention to the throes of this process pulsating in the nineteen twenties. The Justice party got liquidated in the elections of 1936-7. Yet there is clear proof that the spirit which had given rise to the movement and the party has not abated. The recently organized Dravidian Federation has taken upon itself the

role of militancy. And in doing so it has effected a strange and dangerous mixture of caste-cum-racial aspects with semi-Marxian ideology of social equality. The Brahmins of the South and most inhabitants of North India are held up as the Aryan race alien to the Dravidians. To destroy the influence of Brahmins and of the people of the North is the first step towards the establishment of the state of Dravidistan. So far the movement has not gathered great strength and the Congress Government of Madras has more than once ordered the detention of its leader. But it is a clear pointer to the feasibility of creating group solidarity on the caste basis of disgruntled elements by an appeal to the very enticing panacea of socialistic and communistic equalitarian dogmas.

If the Federation has not gathered much strength as yet, it is partly at least the result of the Congress Government itself pursuing in the spheres of education and the recruitment to services a policy which meets with full support from the non-Brahmin sections, whether within the Federation or outside it.[15]

My judgement has been amply borne out by the events that occurred during the last three or four years. *The Times of India* in a leader of its issue of August 3, 1953 summarised the situation and its causes. The Communal Order on admission to colleges and services restricting the chances for Brahmins had to be scrapped. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, the Brahmin, had to be called back to the office of the Chief Minister. There was the question of the imposition of Hindi. The Dravida Kazagam adopted violent means to express its displeasure and in some places at least it was met by Congress Youth violence.

The true remedy against the evil of caste is to fight caste-patriotism on all fronts. Anything, either in our individual capacity or in our administration, that gives prominence to caste tends to create in the minds of the members of a caste tender feelings about it. It follows from this that in order to diminish caste loyalty the first step that we should take is to ignore it altogether. The State must make it clear by

its action that it does not recognize caste as caste, though its individual members may be guided by its group existence. It ought forthwith to cease making any inquiry about a citizen's caste. Caste must be regarded as a purely individual concern with which the State as the national organization should have nothing to do. Neither in official records, nor in applications, nor in statistical returns must the caste of a citizen be recorded. The Census need not busy itself with recording the caste of individuals nor should it present any tables by castes. This was written in 1931. I am happy to find that the National Government has taken steps almost identical with these suggestions.[16]

In many cases one's caste is recorded in one's surname. For there are many castes in which the name of the caste or sub-caste group itself is used as the surname. Progressive individuals have realized the anti-social potentialities of this practice and some of them, though very few, have recently come forward to adjust their names. The reaction to such individual action so far known testifies to the vitality of caste-feeling. When Mr. Manickavelu Naicker, the Revenue Minister of Madras, announced in April 1955 that he would no longer use Naicker which is a caste-name as his Surname, the caste-group, which now describes itself as the Vanniakula Kshatriyas, passed resolutions accusing him of showing disrespect to the entire community. He is said to have received threatening letters. Its outcome is still unknown. When a month later, the North Indian Mr. Shriman Narayan Agarwal, the General Secretary of the Congress, dropped his caste surname and described himself as Mr. Shriman Narayan only, the reaction took the desirable form of inducing the General Secretary of the U.P. Pradesh Congress to drop his caste-name.[17]

Every educated and progressive Hindu leader ought to ignore caste. He must not only denounce the institution on the platform and in the press, but must show by his way of living that his professions are sincere. He should never associate himself with any caste council, even though it may

be doing some little immediate good to its members, always remembering that even the good emanating from a fundamental evil is so much tainted that it loses the moral characteristics of the good. If prominent leaders continue dinning into the ears of their followers that thinking in terms of caste is an unadulterated evil, and if they further carry out their precepts in practice, I am sure the sentiment of caste loyalty will slowly die a natural death. We have to create an atmosphere where even partially educated people should be ashamed of boasting of their caste and of decrying the caste of others in place of the present situation where individuals proudly and blantantly speak of their castes and caste-associations as their communities. This can be achieved by constant preaching and unfailing practice of the leaders.

Fusion of blood has been found to be an effective method of cementing alliances and nurturing nationalities. The history of royal families and of European nations is replete with such examples. To further our national ideals we must resort to the same procedure. Caste sets its face against such a custom, as it is of the essence of caste that marriage must be within its limits. That parents must seek mates for their children from among the members of their caste is a circumstance that forces people in no small measure to make friendships in the caste and in other ways to help its aggrandizing programme. Economic progress of one's caste means increased facility for finding out well-to-do husbands for one's daughters or wives for sons. Once marriage becomes free and unfettered by extraneous considerations, one of the inner motives for participation in the organized activities of a caste will vanish.

I invite my reader's attention to the following words of mellowed wisdom of the statesman and philosophic historian, James Bryce. "Social structure is an important factor. Where men are divided by language, or by religion, or caste distinctions grounded on race or on occupation, there are grounds for mutual distrust and animosity which make it hard for them to act together or for each section to recognize equal

rights in the other. Homogeneity, though it may not avert class wars, helps each class of the community to understand the mind of the others, and creates a general opinion in a nation."[18]

As marriage comes to be arranged by the young parties in preference to their elders, restrictions of caste on marriage will vanish in proportion. We have seen that most of such inter-caste marriages that have taken place were managed by the youths, and their parents and guardians had no effective voice therein. As marriage becomes an affair to be managed among the young by their own choice, proper opportunities for the young people to come into touch with those of the opposite sex must be provided. Otherwise marriage either becomes difficult or maladjusted. That is the experience of many parents and guardians who have educated their daughters or female wards up to the highest standards of university education. It appears to me that co-education at all stages of instruction is the best method of bringing together young people of opposite sex, apart from its being the best prophylactic for sex morals. The enthusiasm of youth will surely transcend the artificial bounds of caste.

Thus while caste would be ignored and caste-patriotism actively denounced, the people who marry without reference to caste would not only create a casteless atmosphere for the management of civic affairs, but would rear up a generation, which would be still more hostile to caste. Even though uneducated and village folk may continue to marry in their own castes, the further evil effects of endogamy, viz., the creation of caste-patriotism, would be effectively checked. In the previous chapter I have shown that untouchability is the last of the social disabilities of the caste regime still present with us. I have also indicated that it must be rigorously put down in all public institutions. I have suggested, contrary to my confirmed view about ignoring caste, that the present untouchable classes should be given special educational facilities. For education, with the consequent amelioration of economic position, will alone enable the reformers

to solve the problem of untouchability, and no amount of mere propaganda against it can achieve that end. As far as legal removal of untouchability is concerned it has been achieved.

As the result of our analysis we saw that the old bonds of this finely graded society have dwindled away. Some of these bonds, viz., of the village economy, are such that, however we may regret their decadence, we cannot reinstate them. We are sorry; but, in full realization of the tremendous changes in the social condition of man, we make peace with the new era. On the other hand, the feature of contemporary Hindu society which tends to snap the running thread of common priesthood is to my mind fundamentally harmful. It is not suggested that we should see the Brahmin enthroned once again as the monopolist of priestly services in direct opposition to the pronounced views of some of the higher castes amongst the non-Brahmins. I think that the facts must be squarely faced by all the leaders of Hindu society and particularly by the orthodox ones. I strongly believe that the time has arrived when the Hindus must not leave their priestly function in the hands of anybody who chooses to parade himself as a priest. A central organization with provincial branches should be started to impart training in priesthood. Only those who hold the requisite certificates from this association should be allowed to practise the profession. In the matter of admission, the orthodox section should unconditionally surrender itself to the reformed view, and allow any one possessing the minimum standard of education the right to join the institutions maintained by this association for training in priestcraft. No longer should the old distinction between Vedic rites and non-Vedic ones be maintained. It must be the choice of the worshipper to ask his priest to condut his service either according to the Vedic formulae or the Puranic ones. So long as the overwhelming majority continue to believe in ritualism, with all the past sins of the priestly class, it is better to have well-informed priests, who should be asked to pledge themselves that they shall conduct their service according to the dictates of

the worshipper as to whether the one or the other type of formulae be used. It would provide Hindu society with its old bond of a common priesthood, based not on hereditary right but on liking and capacity. It would at the same time take the edge off the non-Brahmin clamour against the Brahmin priests.

The recent political upheaval and the consequent achievement of freedom have liberated tremendous psychical energy which, it appears to me, if properly utilized by the leaders, should lead to the achievement of the reforms advocated above. Perhaps a sceptic whispers, "Such revolutions are not brought about in the lethargic types of Indian climes." Him I only remind that this apparently lethargic land and its peoples have, in the past, proved themselves capable of truly great achievements. The phenomenon of the conquering Indo-Aryans, who were passionate eaters of flesh and drinkers of intoxicating beverages, settling down as the upper castes of Hindu society and abjuring their coveted food and drink for centuries, is a moral triumph of the people of India, for which there is hardly any parallel in human history. The same people, now called upon to throw off caste, would rise to the occasion and achieve a still greater triumph.

Between 1931, when the above paragraph was written, and now, that is just within twenty years, age-long untouchability has almost disappeared.[19] But let this apparent success in one aspect of caste-system, the tyranny of the theory of ceremonial purity and of pollution, not lead my countrymen to believe that the task of uprooting caste is easy or that the desired revolution will come about as a natural consequence of the spread of national sentiment or socialistic ideology. Speedy removal of untouchability has been possible because there has been a great decline in belief in ceremonial purity in general and in pollution in particular. As a testimony of the utter unconcern about pollution in general one may note the almost total absence in cities and even towns of the observance of menstrual pollution as well as of death impurity. And Mr. N. G. Chapekar, a keen Marathi litterateur,

observing his village Badlapur for over a quarter of a century, has recently stated that even among the Brahmins, ideas of ceremonial purity have almost vanished.[20]

1. *Young India*, by Mahatma Gandhi, 1919-22, pp. 479-88.
2. In this connection attention may be drawn to A. J. Toynbee's criticism of Plato's ideal of four castes: vide *Ency. of R. & E.*, vol. X, p. 552. (b).
3. On status cf. T. H. Marshall in *Ghurye Felicitation Volume*, pp. 13-18.
4. P. Kodanda Rao in *The Times of India*, July 24, 1953; *Madras Information, Palm Gur Supplement*, July 1953, pp. 2, 15.
5. A. Mitra, the Superintendent of the West Bengal Census of 1951 remarks at p. 5 of his report on *Tribes & Castes of West Bengal* (1953): "The Constitution defines *Backward Classes*, a third category of persons, by enumerating for each State its *Non-Backward Classes*". These number 33 in West Bengal according to him. When I came upon this, I was rather surprised because I did not remember having come across it in the Constitution which I praised in the 2nd edition of this book for this freedom from caste references. I have since then looked up the annotated editions of the Constitution and I am glad to say that nowhere is there any mention of this astounding revelation.
6. *The Times of India*, Nov. 1, 1948.
7. Ibid., August 18, 1950.
8. Ibid., 10-3-56.
9. Ibid., 16-4-55.
10. Ibid., 24-5-56.
11. Ibid., 20-2-52, 2-4-55, 8-3-55.
12. Ibid., 11-3-55.
13. *Ghurye Felicitation Volume*, p. 197.
14. *Sociological Bulletin*, vol. III, pt., I, p. 82.
15. *The Times of India*, May 21, 1949, South Indian Scene.
16. The Census of India, 1951; for a Bill introduced in the Madras Assembly see *The Times of India*, August 4, 1949.
17. *The Times of India*, 21-4-55, 18-5-55.
18. *Modern Democracies*, vol. I, p. 68.
19. This opinion is revised and stated in a modified form in chapter X specially written for this edition.
20. *Ghurye Felicitation Volume*, p. 173.

10

Scheduled Caste

Time and again the reader has come across the expression untouchable classes, depressed classes and the names of certain groups like Chandala and in the last chapter the term Scheduled Castes too. As is clear from the last reference the term Scheduled Castes is the expression standardised in the Constitution of the Republic of India. Contrary to usual practice the Constitution does not contain a definition of the term Scheduled Castes. Article 341 of the Constitution empowers the President, after consulting the head of the particular State, to notify by an order "the castes, races or tribes or parts of or groups within castes, races or tribes" "which shall for the purposes of this Constitution be deemed to be Scheduled Castes in relation to that State". And the second clause of the Article empowers the Parliament to pass a law to include in or exclude from the list so notified by the President "any caste, race or tribe or part of or group within any caste, race or tribe." I may define the Scheduled Castes therefore as those groups which are named in the Scheduled Castes Order in force for the time being.

The expression thus standardised in the Constitution was first coined by the Simon Commission and embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, in Section 309. The main commission, its Education Committee and the Franchise Commission studied the cases of what till then were called either the untouchables, the depressed classes or the backward classes. Though Mahatma Gandhi had, through his weekly *The Harijan* and his Harijan Sevak Sangh and other organisations, his propaganda and his fasts, tried to designate these classes as Harijans, the framers of the Constitution, the largest bulk of whom were staunch followers and devotees of Gandhi, surprisingly adopted the term coined by the Simon Commis-

sion.

The Scheduled Castes, formerly known as depressed classes and forming the fifth order of the four fold society of Hindu theory of caste, have in the Republican Constitution been provided with not only special privileges in the matter of recruitment to services but also with special representation in the legislative bodies. It is but proper that their history and present position should, in a book like this, be given separate treatment to enable the readers to get a connected view of the situation.

Ideas of purity, whether occupational or ceremonial, which are found to have been a factor in the genesis of caste are the very soul of the idea and practice of untouchability. The fact that in the sacrificial creation of mankind the last order mentioned as having been created from the feet of the creater is that of the Śūdra and that there was no other class of human beings created thereafter adds flesh and blood to the ideas of ceremonial and occupational purity to incarnate the theory and practice of untouchability.

As we have seen, outside this indirect support for or suggestion of all classes of men not comprised under the four orders, Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra, being unsanctified owing to their lack of association with the body of the Creator, ideas of ceremonial purity were rife enough even in the times of the Brāhmaṇas, i.e. the later vedic age, for certain restrictions to be placed on the use of and intercourse with the Śūdras in the performance of sacrifices. It is expressly stated in the Panchavimsa Brāhmaṇa that a person consecrated for the performance of a sacrifice should not address a Śūdra, that a Śūdra should not be allowed to be present in the hall where a sacrifice was being offered and that the milk to be used for a fire-oblation should not have been milked by a Śūdra.[1] The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[2] in warning a Kshatriya to avoid certain mistakes in the sacrificial ritual which, if committed, would lead to dire consequences, informs the reader that meticulous adherence to the details

of ritual had already become an accepted dogma.

Already in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka we come across full-fledged rules of abstinence and avoidance to be observed not only in connection with special vows and rituals but also with the seasonal study period. It is stated that for the performance of a certain ritual the performer must have not eaten meat for a whole year, nor must he have had sexual intercourse, nor must he drink from a clay-vessel. But the most significant tabu or prohibition is that the leavings of the performer's drink—and I should presume food too—should not have been drunk or eaten by his son. For it is declared that it, that is such leavings, is lustre itself. Here is an idea very akin to the primitive idea of mana, involved in the concept of the remnants or leavings of one's food or drink. This reference to leavings or remnants of food and drink is not solitary. In the Chhāndogyopanishad[3] there is an argument about the partaking of such leavings. A Brahmin by name Ushasti Chakrayana being in distress begged some food of an elephant-owner who was eating beans. The latter pointing out to the beans he had before him in his dish told him that he had no stock of them besides those. Ushasti asked for some of those laid out in the dish, whereupon the elephant-owner gave him some. And whether out of mischievous ideas or out of usual courtesy—the context suggests the former—he offered him also water from his jug out of which he himself had drunk. Ushasti declined the drink as having been the remnant, 'uchchhishṭa', and hence polluted. The elephant-owner promptly asked Ushasti whether the beans were not such unacceptable remnants. Ushasti replied that he had taken the beans because without them in his condition he could not have lived and added that he had declined the drink because he would not die without it. Thus ordinarily leavings or remnants of another's food or drink was not to be taken, being considered polluting.

Ideas of ceremonial purity as centred round food and drink, thus, early tabooed the giving and partaking of these between one individual and another, whether without rela-

tionship or with the closest of relationship. Milk and by implication food required for a sacrifice was so sacrosanct that it could not be brought by a Śūdra without polluting it and thus rendering it unfit for sanctified use. The remnant of sanctified or sacrificial food too, it appears, had come to be regarded as requiring special protection against defilement by its being used by some classes of persons. At least we know quite definitely that giving of the remnants of sacrificial food to a low person was unusual and could be justified only in exceptional cases. In the Chhāndogyopanishad it is stated that if one who has realised the true nature of 'Brahman' offers the remnants of the food used for the Agnihotra sacrifice even to a Chandala it is offered as an oblation in that sacrificial fire.[4] *Per contra* such food being offered to a Chaṇḍāla is an abomination. It is necessary to remember that earlier in the same work[5] it is stated, almost in so many words, that the breed of the Chandala is a degraded one and is ranked with that of the dog and the pig.

Before 800 B.C. we thus find the idea of ceremonial purity almost full-fledged and even operative in relation to not only the despised and degraded group of people called Chaṇḍālas but also the fourth order of society, the Śūdras.

The Dharmasūtra writers[6] declare the Chaṇḍālas to be the progeny of the most hated of the reverse order of mixed unions, that of a Brahmin female with a Śūdra male. Kautilya, the practical administrator[1] who provides for a number of these so-called mixed castes agrees with the Dharma-writers that of the mixed castes those that arise out of the unions in the inverse order bespeak violation of Dharma yet looks upon all of them as mixed castes. He exhorts that they should marry among themselves and should follow the customs and avocations as far as possible of their ancestors. He has no objection if they treat themselves as Śūdras but he too regards the Chaṇḍālas so low that he advises all other mixed castes to avoid being with the Chandalas. It is interesting to note that he accommodates the sons born of miscegenation in his law of inheritance.[7]

The treatment of Chaṇḍālas who, as we know, were an ethnic group already referred to in Vedic literature, and one or two similar groups may be further scanned in order to shed proper light on the origin and the problem of the scheduled castes in general. There was a group separately recognised by Vasishṭha, which was called Antyāvasāyin, which he declared was the progeny of a Vaiśya female by a Śūdra male. According to Manu, however, the Antyāvasāyin was of much more depraved origin being the progeny of a Chaṇḍāla male and a Nishāda female. His work was confined to the cremation ground, and according to one commentator he was to be identified with the Chaṇḍāla. It is not easy to explain away the absence of the listing of this group by other Dharma-writers and by Kautilya the administrator. Both Baudhāyana and Vasishṭha mention a degraded caste called Śvapāka. Baudhāyana once declares the group to have risen from the union of an Ambashṭha male with a Brahmin female, while at another place he attributes it to the union of an Ugra male with a Kshattri female. Manu makes Śvapāka the progeny of Kshattri male and an Ugra female, i.e. he gives a derivation which is just the opposite of Baudhāyana's second derivation. He also lists two other groups, one Sopāka and the other Pāṇḍusopāka whom he derives from a Chaṇḍāla father and Kukkusa and Vaideha mother respectively. He prescribes Sopāka the vocation of the hangman and Pāṇḍusopāka that of a cane-worker. It is to be noted that though both Baudhāyana and Manu speak of Śvapāka as the group, yet Manu in describing its particular vocation calls it Śvapacha.[8] The practical administrator Kautilya speaks of the group as Śvapāka and derives it from the union of an Ugra male and a Kshattri female.[9] This derivation agrees with Baudhāyana's second derivation and is just the opposite of that of Manu.

Patañjali, the great grammarian who lived about 150 B.C. and who is generally considered to be a meticulous observer of contemporary usage, has given us his grammatical explanation for the female of the Śvapacha group being called a Śvapacha and not Śvapachī.[10] What exactly were the avoca-

tions and status of a Śvapacha in Patañjali's time we do not know. But we have the valuable information that Patañjali did not illustrate his remarks about certain grammatical formations based on certain social disabilities with the help of the illustration of Śvapachas. In that illustration he speaks of Mritapas in combination with Chaṇḍālas. We also know that the practical administrator Kautilya, rigorously excluding the Chaṇḍālas from all social contacts, did not prescribe similar treatment to the Śvapachas. But Manu[11] is very explicit and insistent that the Śvapachas shall be grouped with Chaṇḍālas and treated as their absolute equals. He prescribes them residence outside the village, and the use of shrouds of corpses as their clothing, broken pots for meals, iron for ornaments and dogs and donkeys for their wealth. They were to be the hangmen who were to be prohibited entry into villages and towns during day-time, were to have been stamped with some marks and were to serve as the undertakers for unclaimed corpses.

As stated above Patañjali of an earlier age than Manu, writing as a student observing society and not laying down its norms, grouped together Chaṇḍālas and Mritapas as a variety of Śūdras. And it is not impossible that this manner of looking upon the Chaṇḍālas and the Mritapas may be as old as Pāṇini's time, that is, 500 B.C. and earlier. We learn that both the Chaṇḍālas and the Mritapas resided within the limits of towns and villages of the Aryas as, it would appear, other Śūdras like carpenters, blacksmiths, washermen, and weavers did. The social distinction on the score of status between such groups as carpenters, blacksmiths, washermen, weavers, etc. on the one hand and the Chaṇḍālas and the Mritapas, on the other, lay not in the fact of touchability or untouchability but only in the distinction made in the use of the meal-vessels of these people. Patañjali assures us by implication that whereas the food-vessels used by such groups as carpenters, blacksmiths, washermen and weavers could be used by others after cleansing them in a particular manner, the food-vessels of Chaṇḍālas and Mritapas could not be used by others, because no known method of cleansing pots was

regarded as adequate to purify them. Chaṇḍālas and Mritapas were technically 'apapātras'.

As stated in an earlier chapter Patañjali's remarks lend support to the inference that there were other Śūdras than Chaṇḍālas and Mritapas who had to live outside the limits of Ārya villages and towns.

It is noteworthy that the technical term 'apapātra' used by Patañjali to characterize Chaṇḍālas and Mritapas was used by Dharmasūtra writers like Baudhāyana but without specifying the groups. Baudhāyana[12] exhorted Brahmins not to recite the Veda within hearing or sight of Śūdras or 'apapātras'. From the context it may be inferred that by 'apapātras' Baudhāyana meant the same people to whom the term was applied by Patañjali and even earlier by Paṇini.

We may conclude that the classes of people called Chaṇḍālas, Śvapachas and Mritapas had slowly but surely deteriorated in their social position between the time of Paṇini and that of Manu. In the former age they lived within the limits of the village in which other orders and castes lived. In the age of Manu they were not only excluded from the village but were assigned duties and perquisites which clearly show that they were looked upon as vile specimens of humanity.

The Buddhist birth-stories called Jātakas, written in Pali, may be taken to reflect mainly the conditions prevailing east of Allahabad about the 2nd century B.C. We read in them of Chaṇḍālas as the lowest caste, though here and there in enumeration of castes another group, the later Vedic Pukkusa, is mentioned after Chaṇḍālas as lower than it. The references to Chaṇḍālas are specific and almost invariably show them as a despised group, to see members of which is to see evil to avert which one must at least wash one's eyes. They are described as occupying sites outside regular villages and towns whether in the west near Taxila or in the centre near Ujjain. They could be detected by their special dialect. Sweeping was their hereditary occupation.[13]

The causes that led to this degradation of these communities are not known. We can only surmise that in addition to the ideas of ceremonial purity which necessarily led to the despise of occupations of these people there was perhaps the baneful influence of the belief that they were the result of miscegenation with Brahmin females.

A word needs to be said about the identification of Mritapa of Patañjali, Śvapacha of Baudhāyana, Manu and Kautilya and the Dom. Alberuni[14] writing in about 1020 A.D. grouped together Dom and Chandala as two of the groups "not reckoned among any caste or guild. They are occupied with dirty work, like the cleansing of the villages and other services. They are considered as one sole class, and distinguished only by their occupations." Hemachandra, the grammarian writing about a century later in his Deśināmamāla[15] tells us that Dumba [Dom or Dumba] was a Deśi word for Śvapacha. He vouchsafes us the additional information that the Chaṇḍālas carried a stick in their hands to warn people to avoid their touch which received a specific Desi name viz. 'jhajjhari'. Kalhaṇa, the Brahmin historian of Kashmir, in his Rājataraṅgiṇī,[16] whose writing was completed in A.D. 1150, has narrated how king Chakravarman fell on evil ways being caught in the whirlwind of passion of two daughters of a Domba musician, Hansi and Nāgalatā by name, who were themselves clever musicians and dancers. Alternatively he speaks of the Dombas and the two women as Śvapākas. The king was so maddened with passion that he crowned Hansi as the chief queen. He then describes in a manner which bespeaks of his wrung heart how the ministers and others reconciled themselves not only to working with the Śvapāki queen and her Śvapacha dear ones but also went to the length of eating the leavings of her food. Kalhaṇa's reaction as a moralising historian is characteristic. He remarks, "In the realm at that time surely powerful deities did not reside, how else could a Śvapaka woman (Śvapāki) have entered their temples!" Nevertheless it is worthwhile noting the different reaction of the same irate Brahmin historian, who was terribly upset by the doings of

the King Chakravarman, describing one of the most laudable kings of Kashmir, viz. Yasaskara, who came to the throne about sixteen years after Chakravarman. After narrating how his administration seemed to usher in the dawn of the Golden Age (Krita Yuga) he almost ascribes his later fall to his not having got rid of those servants of his who in the reign of Chakravarman had partaken of the leavings of food of the Dombas. His grievance appears to be that though versed in the Vedas and accustomed to the use of earth and water for purification he did not realise that he was being polluted by his association with persons who had partaken of the Dombas' food-remnants. He has not told us anywhere if the temple which the Domba queen used to visit had been purified by any rite. Yet he makes up for this lack by informing his readers that fire destroyed the great houses and purified the land (VI, 192). We may conclude that the people of Kashmir in the time of Kalhaṇa were not much scandalised by either the touch of the Dombas or Śvapachas or even by the acceptance of the food of the aristocratic ones among them. And if they tolerated the visits of the Domba queen to their temples we may conclude that in their view the royal status of a person removed all traditional and hereditary disabilities from him. It is in keeping with this attitude that one finds here and there mentioned the Śvapāka soldier and his exploits in archery (V, 218). Still more illuminating is the statement about the doings of Shridev, a village Chaṇḍāla who accompanying the villagers of Suskaletra to the battle between Jayāpīḍa and the usurper Jajja (about A.D. 750) killed the latter with a stone from his sling (IV, 473-477). It is no wonder that in a society like that Chandalas were employed as night watchmen (VI, 77).

Further corroboration of the anomalous position and the ambivalent attitude of Kashmirian society towards Chandalas is afforded by the life and career of a great engineer who lived in the reign of Avantivarman (A.D. 857-884). After the reign of Jayāpīḍa, there was a great famine in Kashmir. But Avantivarman after a long time was able to restore normalcy through the fortunate circumstance of having in his

service a great engineer by name Suyyā, who trained the course of a river, put up dams and irrigated a large tract of the country which not only relieved the famine but brought plenty to the Kashmirians (V, 71-120). Suyyā's parentage as given by Kalhaṇa is the most interesting part of the story. Suyyā was so-called because he was the adopted son of a Chandala woman named Suyyā. Suyyā while sweeping the streets one day found an earthen pot with a lid on it. Opening the lid she was struck by the sight of a fine baby comfortably sucking its own fingers. Suyyā felt the impulse of a mother towards it. What Suyyā actually did may or may not be what has been described by Kalhaṇa the Brahmin. He assures us that Suyyā arranged the baby's nurture with a Śūdra wet-nurse. Though the Brahmin historian is very particular in stating that she did not pollute the infant by her touch, yet, under the circumstances narrated by the historian himself, one is almost certain that Suyyā must have handled the baby. Was it merely because Suyyā was paying the fees to the Śūdra wet-nurse for the baby's upkeep that Suyyā came to be known after Suyyā and did so much to commemorate her memory in his days of triumph? While trying to answer the query, it is necessary to remember that he not only constructed a bridge and named it after her, but also granted a village to Brahmins and named it Suyyakundala in memory of her. We may conclude that the Kashmirians of the ninth century A.D. were quite willing to give scope to the abilities of a person of unknown parentage and of known Śūdra and Chaṇḍāla fosterage. That a bridge could be named after a Chandali and a village named after her could be accepted as a gift by Brahmins speak of the ambivalent attitude towards these groups postulated above as current in earlier ages. However, not only Chaṇḍālas and Doms but Charmakārs or Chamars too are described as untouchables, 'aspriśya'.[16] (IV, 55, 65, 76; V, 74; VI, 192; VII, 309, 314).

Further east, however, in Hindusthan proper about a century and a half before Kalhaṇa's time Alberuni, (Vol. I, pp. 101-2) a foreign student of our life and civilization, has left

a record of a much different situation. But even that situation as will be manifest is slightly at least different from the one of utter degradation posited by Manu. First, one notes that all the four orders are described not only as living together in the same towns and villages but as also "mixed together in the same housings and lodgings". According to Alberuni's information and findings there were two other classes of people, who were "not reckoned among any caste." The first group noticed by him was formed by people following certain crafts, eight in number, who were grouped together as Antyajas. Within this group, which as a whole, forming eight guilds, had to live near but outside the villages and the towns of the four castes, there were two sub-divisions. Jugglers, basket-and shield-makers, sailors, fishermen, and hunters of wild animals and birds, could freely intermarry though they belonged to separate guilds. But none of their members would condescend to have anything to do with the fuller, the shoemaker and the weaver. These latter three, forming the second sub-division of the Antyajas, it appears, would either marry among themselves or at least had close mutuality. The sixth class of people, Antyajas being the fifth, had, according to Alberuni, four named groups among them, of which two viz. Doma (Domba) and Chaṇḍāla are the two groups about which we have known so much from Patanjali, Hemachandra and Kalhaṇa. They were occupied with "dirty work like the cleansing of the villages and other services." They were considered, "as one sole class, and distinguished only by their occupations". The Doma's other occupation was that of the player on the lute and of the singer.

Chandalas as a group has been known from Bengal. In the Census of 1901 at which caste-names and caste precedence were scrutinized and registered rather minutely, the Chandalas of Bengal, who were otherwise known as Nāmaśūdras then numbered over 18.5 lakhs, being the largest caste of East Bengal. Its status was low in social scale being considered to be a clean untouchable group. It had eight main functional divisions which neither ate nor intermarried among themselves. The agricultural section stood out pre-eminent

and the boating division followed. The caste or rather the group was not served by community barbers but by their own castemen working in that capacity. The Brahmins that served it were classed as a degraded Brahmin group.[17] From the Census of 1921 onwards the group has been recorded as Nāmaśūdra and in the Census of 1951 we have the Dom, an unclean untouchable group, alternatively called Chandala. Yet the Nāmaśūdra is one of the Scheduled Castes of the Government of India Order. The caste numbered 3.2 lakhs in 1951, in West Bengal. They are now mostly occupied in cultivation and boat-plying. Some of them are carpenters, traders and shopkeepers. "A considerable number now follow the various so-called learned professions". Yet their social position as a caste is very low.[18]

The Chanal caste of Simla Hills in the Panjab appears to bear similarity of name with the Chandalas but was concerned with skinning of dead animals and leather-working. No other group or caste has been known to have the name of the Chandala.

The Doms, one of whose occupations has been singing, dancing and playing on instruments in the Panjab have been carrying on as village sweepers and as workers in cane. But in the Sub-Himalayan districts of Kumaon and Garhwal, Dom lives by agriculture and village handicrafts. In Bengal he forms an immigrant caste introduced there for the specific purpose of the filthiest of work. In Bihar and part of U.P. he is divided into two sections: one, the settled one being a village worker, mat-weaver and basket-maker "with a little scavenging thrown in"; the other section, a more or less nomadic one, provides gangs, "said to be expert and artistic burglars and thieves". South of the Narmada in the Andhra Desh they are weavers of coarse cloth and in the Deccan "acrobats, dancers and bad characters generally." The hill community of the Doms according to Baines "is divided into four groups, field labourers, weavers, and metal workers; cane-workers and the lower artisans; exorcists, porters and leather-workers; and, finally, musicians, mendicants, and

tailors". In the Panjab there is another group, slightly differing in name, called Dum, and otherwise known as Mirasi, who are vocationally ministrels and genealogists, some Jat families employing them for this purpose. They have also musical pretensions, and their women give dance performances before females. Almost all of them are Muslims. In Bengal there was a section which carried on fishing. In the Andhra Desh they are found in small numbers under the name of Dombar or Dommara, which is also the name of a caste in Maharashtra noted for similar attainments.[19]

In 1901 the Doms under all appellations totalled over 8.5 lakhs, being in significantly large numbers only in Bengal and the U.P. In the former they numbered over 3.5 lakhs and in the latter province over 2.4 lakhs. In both regions they were grouped among the unclean untouchables as almost the lowest amongst castes. That they are commonly looked upon as the lowest group in Bengal is evidenced by the fact that the old name of the most despised caste, Chandala, has been latterly reserved for it. Yet its position in the Hindu caste hierarchy is by no means so certain. For Baines, a careful ethnographer could make only the following qualified remark about it: "Here, then, is found a caste which, if not at the bottom of the social scale, is, at least, not far from it."[20]

The Doms ate all manner of unclean food. For them no Brahmin could be found to administer to their religious needs, neither would the common barber nor the common washerman would work for them. In 1951 their number in West Bengal was 1.1 lakhs.

The Dom was only one of the castes traditionally concerned with scavenging. The other castes were the Chuhra in the Panjab, the Bhangi mehtar in Rajasthan and Bombay, the Bhuinmali and Hari in Bengal and the Haddi in Orissa. In the South partly the male in Andhra Desh and partly the Paraiyan in Tamilnad carried on the scavenging. While the Māla chiefly was a leather worker, the Paraiyan was a field-

labourer. Leaving out the Māla and the Paraiyan, the precise numbers of which castes engaged in scavenging cannot be ascertained, and confining one's attention to those castes which were wholly engaged in scavenging, one finds that in 1901 the latter castes including the Dom had together more than 36 lakhs of members. The largest single caste, ignoring again the Paraiyan and the Māla, was the Chuhra of the Panjab, having been over 13 lakhs strong.

The Marathi Mahār, the Telugu Māla and the Tamil Paraiyan, though because of their village menial status are grouped together as field-labourer, conveyed pollution without touch, either at a specific distance or by their shadow, and were classed as impure untouchables. In 1901, they numbered 25.6, 18.6 and 22.6 lakhs respectively. Drumming and playing on pipe-music is one of their side occupations satisfying one of the needs of village life. No boundary dispute in a village could be finally settled without the help of these castes in their respective regions. More often than not disposing off the dead cattle of the village was also their duty.

In the current list of Scheduled Castes, Chanāl or Chandala figures in the States of Madras, Orissa, Panjab and Pepsu, and Namasudra in Assam and West Bengal. The Dom appears in the States of Bihar, Madras, Orissa, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal. The very wide though discontinuous distribution of Chandala and Dom, two groups which undoubtedly appear to have been ethnic in origin, creates a presumption in favour of the theory that some of the untouchable groups must have originated in the conquest of the natives by the incoming Aryans.

By far the largest group appearing under a single name though widely distributed, being represented over the whole of the Indo-Aryan area and sporadically even in Madras, is the Chamar or the Chambhar, whose name proclaims him to be the worker in leather. We know definitely that under more or less the same name the Chamar's craft flourished in

the Vedic age but are not quite sure that it was entirely free from the stigma of despise. Manu[21] speaks of two groups or castes concerned with leather-working, both of them being very mixed in origin. Their names are the unfamiliar and non-current Kārāvara and Dhigvaṇa. The former is described in occupational terms as Charmakāra, 'cutter of hide', the origin of the current terms, Chamara and Chambhara, for the leather working caste in the Indo-Aryan regions. The Dhigvana's occupation, that of working in leather and trading in leather products, is represented in recent and contemporary society in the above-mentioned regions by the Mochi or Muchi. From the context in Manu's text it is clear that though the groups must have been despised first because of their supposed mixed origin and second because of their work in a dirty, filthy and impure commodity, yet they were not required to live outside the villages or towns.

The Chamar has been one of the village menials in the traditional village economy, entitled to his customary share at the harvest. Though his chief contribution to the life of the village was through his hide and leather working yet he played no mean part in it, as a field labourer. It was the largest single group going under one name next only to the Brahmin. The Chamar numbered over 1.12 crores in 1901, when the Brahmin registered 1.49 crores (14.9 millions). The largest contingent of Chamars came from U.P., forming about 52.6 per cent of the total. Mochi or Muchi is more or less an urban caste and not always so designated and separated from the Chamar. But wherever separated it is accorded a higher status. In 1901 only a million persons were registered under this name. The superior status enjoyed by this caste can be clearly seen from the fact that in the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Order (Amendment) Act, 1956, the Mochis of Gujarat division have been dropped out of the list of the Scheduled Castes of Bombay State.

I have drawn my reader's attention to the reform and ameliorative movements patronised by Chamars. Here I shall only add that among the alternative names assumed by

this caste group figure not only Ramdasia, Satnami and Raidasi but also Rohit, Rohidas, Rabidas, Ruidas, Ramnami and Rishi. Though the Chamar is counted among the unclean untouchables because of the fact that the flesh of dead animals or beef or both entered in his diet yet in some parts of the country he used to be served by some kind of a Brahmin.

Hide and leather working has been the traditional occupation of the Mādiga and the Chakkiliyan in the South. Together their members numbered over 17 lakhs in 1901. A section of the Māla also carried on this occupation. It is worthwhile noting that in the Vedas the root 'mlā' meant 'to tan'.

Above the impure untouchables were the pure untouchables, who had abjured beef and such other anathematic diet and who polluted only by their touch. In the U.P., the Pasi, who numbered over 12 lakhs in 1901 and the Kori who numbered about 10 lakhs were the largest single units among the twentyfive or so castes which were listed under this category. In Bihar among the seventeen castes of this group the numerically most important were the Dosādh, over 12 lakhs, and the Musāhāra, over 6 lakhs. The largest bulk of the castes of this group, numerically speaking, came from Bengal, where among the twentyfive such castes, the Rajbansi Koch, the Namasudra already referred to, and the Bagdi were the largest, having over 24 lakhs, over 20 lakhs and over 10 lakhs members respectively. In Madras, the principal castes of this group were the Paḷḷan, the Shānān and the Thiyan, numbering over 8 lakhs, over 6 lakhs and nearly 6 lakhs respectively. These ten castes were the largest single units each with half a million or more members among the two hundred or so castes that were classed as clean untouchables. In 1901 these clean untouchables together numbered about 2 crores (20 millions), and the ten castes specifically mentioned above formed more than 50 per cent of the total.

I shall leave out the Namasudra about which caste I have

already given some particulars. Of the others, the Rajbansi Koch were grouped by Baines under the category of dominant land-holders. In West Bengal according to the census of 1951, the Rajbansis numbered somewhat over 7 lakhs only and are described as included among the castes "that get the appellation of 'jālia'," among the others figuring Bagdis, Bauris, Kaivartas. Many of the Rajbansi Koch, though described as an aboriginal cultivating caste, have been putting on the sacred thread to claim Kshatriya status.[22]

The Bihari Musāhāra, the Bengali Bagdi and the Tamil Paḷḷan, Baines classed as field-labourers. The Musāhara as his name indicates eats field-rats but the Bengali Bagdi is believed to be more particular about his diet. The Paḷḷan must be distinguished from the Palli. The latter are classed as Śūdras who habitually employ Brahmins and whose touch only slightly pollutes, while the former are grouped with castes which pollute without touch and at a distance.

The Bihari Dosādh, described as watchmen, are so because of their former soldierly tradition and present propensity towards crimes against property. And as not all of them can maintain themselves by this activity a fairly large section is engaged in porterage and day-labour. Baines[23] informs us that the Dosādhs furnished many recruits to the Muslim armies of Bengal and not a few of them fought on the side of Clive in the battle of Plassey.

Some artisan castes have been relegated to the class of pure untouchables in the caste system. I have here selected the most interesting case of such castes, the one which is perhaps the largest in numbers. It is the Kori of U.P. and Bihar which is described by Baines as the weaver caste of Northern India. The weaver has not been one of the regular officials or menials of the village-community. He has been generally placed above workers in leather and such other impure materials, the Bengali Tanti and perhaps the Maharashtrian Koshti enjoying even higher status. The Kon in particular seem to have connection with the leather working

caste as the names of their sub-sections show.[24]

The remaining three castes, the Pasi, the Thiyan and the Shānān, are some of the toddy-tapping castes of the country. The Pasi, the largest among them have their concentration in U.P. but are also met with in Bihar. Their traditional occupation is believed to be toddy-tapping, the name having been derived from the word 'pāśa' meaning 'a noose', 'a loop', the rope-belt the members use as footrest to climb the palms with. The same occupation was carried on in the south-western coast by the Thiyan, the southerner, and by the Shānān in the extreme south and the south-east. The name Shānān appears to be a comparatively recent innovation. Anyway in the region in which the Shānārs are found, an inscription of the 11th century A.D. mentions the Idiga and the Iluvan as the toddy-tapping castes. The word Shānān or Shānār is tried to be derived from either the Sanskrit 'Śouṇḍika' or from the two Tamil words 'san' and 'nar', meaning span-long noose, thus bringing the name in line with that of the Pasi.[25]

The Shānān have resented for nearly a century the low status accorded to them. In 1874 they appear to have first attempted militant assertion of their dislike of the status assigned to them by attempting to enter the Minakshi temple at Madura, entry to temples having been prohibited to them and to the other castes of their status.

Such are the principal castes that made up the group of untouchables and unapproachables. In 1901 the whole group totalled 5.32 crores (53.2 millions) and formed 27.4 per cent of the Hindus of the then India. After 1911 till 1941 half a dozen estimates of the persons belonging to the untouchable or exterior or excluded castes were made and are presented in the report of the Franchise or the Lothian Commission which worked in connection with the Simon Commission and its report leading to the Government of India Act, 1935. They vary widely from one another and as they were made with an eye on the political representation of these people I have

left them out. The Census of 1951 has provided us its total enumeration of all the persons belonging to those castes specified in the relevant Constitution Order as Scheduled Castes. They numbered 5.13 crores (51.3 millions) and form 16.9 of the Hindu population of India—Bharat.

As pointed out in an earlier chapter it was perhaps Jyotibā Phule of Poona who was the pioneer in modern times of the movement calculated to improve the condition of and to secure social equality to the erstwhile untouchable and unapproachable classes. V. R. Shinde, himself the twentieth-century torchbearer of Phule-spirit, has stated[25] that the Bengali Brahmin Sasipada Bandopadhyaya started his uplift work among the labourers of Baranagar, among whom untouchables seem to have figured, in 1865. But definite mention of Bandopadhyaya's relations with the Chaṇḍālas occur in Shinde's account of the progressive Brahmin's work in 1870. He, we are informed, used to attend the religious discourses current among one sect of the Chandalas. In later years he used to dine with them and nurse their children.

The Maharashtriya Brahmin-scholar, Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, appears to have gone a step further though perhaps fifteen to twenty years later. In his presidential address to the 9th Indian Social Conference held in 1895 he makes an incidental reference to the touching references made by a Mahāra religious preacher, "kīrtankāra" to the treatment accorded to the untouchables and the great work of the saints, particularly of the Brahmin Ekanātha, in their cause, in his discourse which was given in the house of R. G. Bhandarkar. Bhandarkar invited a Mahāra religious preacher to deliver a religious discourse at his house before 1890 and opined that the Mahāra had good deal of natural intelligence and were capable of being highly educated.[26]

The next landmark in the ameliorative movement is the starting of the Depressed Classes Mission in Bombay by V. R. Shinde and his work for that society. He toured over the whole country addressing meetings in towns exhorting peo-

ple to help the untouchables to rise socially and educationally and making notes of the actual conditions of their life.[27]

From 1924, and perhaps also earlier, Mahatma Gandhi took up the cause and made it a plank in his political platform. The great endeavour of eradicating this feature of the social life of India which the national Government has embarked upon during the last seven years steps from his teaching.

But before Gandhi's advent on the Indian political horizon, something was being done by the then government of the country. In an earlier chapter, I have stated the principal steps taken since 1858. It is seen that some really effective measures began to be taken only after the Reforms of 1918. A complete account of such steps is both impracticable and unnecessary. Some representative data will be laid out to enable readers to form a relative estimate of the measures taken before the achievement of independence. In 1901, U.P. with 1.00 crore (10.0 million) untouchables and Madras with .94 crore (9.4 million) stood second and third respectively among the provinces in the matter of numbers of untouchables. The then Bengal with 1.09 crore (10.9 million) untouchables led all. In 1951 West Bengal with .47 crore (4.7 million) Scheduled Caste people stood fourth in the list, Bihar with .51 crore (5.1 million) taking the third place. U.P. with its 1.15 crore (11.5 million) Scheduled caste people and Madras with its .85 crore (8.5 million) towered over all the others. Some facts about educational conditions of these castes in the last two States before the Government of India Act, 1935 will be quite sufficient for our purpose.

The memorandum submitted to the Indian Statutory Commission by the Government of the United Provinces states[28] that special efforts to encourage the education of the depressed classes were made "in the latter part of the quinquennium 1916-17 to 1921-22". The size of the special efforts can be judged from the fact that in 1927 the sum set apart for the purpose was Rs. one and a half lakhs (1,50,000). In

detailing the educational progress of these classes the memorandum has to begin with the primary education at which stage alone a fair number of pupils of these castes could be met with. As regards the state of further education the memorandum states that whereas in 1921-22 there were 392 and 7 pupils respectively at the middle and high school stages and none either at the collegiate stage or in normal schools and teacher's training classes, in 1926-27 there were 1359 and 41 at the first two stages and 11 at the intermediate, 4 at the post-intermediate and 29 in normal schools and teacher's training classes. These figures and the information conveyed by them the authors of the memorandum prefaced with the words: "Even in higher education these classes have been making headway". The memorandum submitted by Madras Government[29] records, besides the progress of these classes at the primary stage of education, the number of their pupils reading in secondary schools. Whereas in 1921-22 there were 1217 of them, in 1926-27 they were 2647. The Madras Government had also opened two hostels at its own cost to lodge and board students of these classes desirous of taking higher education and to support them in the educational institutions. It brought pressure to bear on the managers of institutions and the local public to admit pupils of these classes into schools not specially intended for them. As a result the number of such pupils rose from 4630 in 1920-21 to 16,486 in 1926-27.

I have stated some of the provisions of the Constitution in this behalf. In accordance with one of them the President of India appointed Shri L. M. Shrikant as the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes towards the end of 1950. He issued his first report, that for 1951, in 1952 and has been issuing an annual report since then, giving the organizational set up and other matters connected with his duties as well as a full account of the money grants and expenditure and the nature of activities financed by them and the organizations handling them. He is now assisted in his onerous responsibilities by six assistant commissioners, one at the headquarters and five at different regional centres.

In his report for the year 1954, the latest available to me, Appendix XII (p. 366) gives the distribution of funds amongst Scheduled Castes and other backward classes students pursuing post-matriculation education from 1944-45 to 1953-54. According to that statement in 1945-46 Rs. 2,12,000 in round numbers were allocated—and I take it spent too—to the post-matriculate students of the Scheduled Castes, while in 1953-54 the sum for them was Rs. 26,86,000, a phenomenal increase! The grant estimated for 1954-55 amounted to Rs. 48,90,000, which dwarfs even the phenomenal rise between 1945-46 and 1953-54. Appendix XIII gives the total number of these scholars in 1954-55 to be 10,392, of whom 3,481, 1,304 and 1,532 were from U.P., Madras-Andhra, and West Bengal respectively. The result of the national endeavour is already reflected in the live registers of the employment exchanges. On the last day of 1954, there were 3,670 technicians, 747 teachers, 15 doctors and 6 engineers among the 59,637 seekers of employment from the Scheduled Castes (Appendix XI, p. 362).

Besides this amount spent on scholarships, the Union Government spends a huge sum on projects and activities designed to remove untouchability and to effect the welfare of the Scheduled Castes. The total expenditure incurred for this purpose in 1952-53 was Rs. 2.85 crores (28.5 millions) and that in 1954-55 Rs. 3.73 crores (37.3 millions), the increase of about 31 per cent in two years testifying to the grand scale of the national endeavour.

As stated in an earlier chapter, State legislatures passed certain legislative measures for the removal of or rather for counteracting the disabilities of untouchability. That activity went on after independence with great regularity and zeal. The crowning glory of it is the Untouchability (Offences) Act, 1955, or Act No. XXII of 1955, being the first direct step taken by the Central Government against untouchability. Under it enforcement of religious disabilities such as non-access to places of worship etc., or of social disabilities like non-access to shops, watering places etc., or

abetment of such is a cognisable offence punishable with imprisonment upto six months and/or fine upto Rs. 500.

The legislative, administrative and executive part of the nation has thus implemented the national pledge made in the Constitution that Untouchability is hereby abolished and has given a thundering proof of its serious purpose. But readers of this book need not be told that the legislative measures against untouchability can at best produce a few ducts in the solid wall whose demolition requires the operation of an active sentiment of the people at large. To illuminate the subject it is then necessary to know how the people at large have been behaving.

In modern times, it was in 1874 that the first militant action by one of the untouchable castes was taken by the Shānārs of Tamilnad. In assertion of a better status than that commonly accorded to them they attempted to enter the Minakshi temple at Madura but were foiled in their attempt. In 1899 to support their claim to Kshatriyahood they attacked the Maravans, their principal opponents, in their quarters at Sivakashi. The latter retaliated, burned a large number of Shānān houses not only in Sivakashi but also in other places in Tinnevelly district. These incidents were so violent that they have gone down in local history as the Tinnevelly riots.[30] This feud between the Shānārs and the Maravans reappeared at the above place again in 1918, though the immediate cause of it was insult and outrage of a Maravan male and a Maravan female by some Shānān. The Maravans were so violent that firing had to be resorted to and in the riots besides unknown number of Shānārs and Maravans killed, two policemen were killed and nine injured.

In 1921 at Vadakkalur in Trichinopoly district some of the Scheduled Castes which by then had begun to call themselves Adi-Dravidas burnt at night the houses of castemen, in retaliation of an attack on their own bridal party in the evening. There had already started a feud between Adi-Dravidas and the castemen establishing tension between them.

The Adi-Dravidas had declined to perform some of the dirty but usual services of the village community and the castemen had replied by dispensing with the customary services of the Adi-Dravidas at marriage and death. In 1925 some of the Scheduled Caste converts to Arya Samaj attempted to enter the Brahmin grant village, 'agrahāram', of Kalpathi in Palghat and general fighting was the result. In 1927 the Kapus were obstructed in and ultimately prevented from carrying a procession of theirs with a particular dance and music by the Mālas to whom that dance and music were offensive.[31] In 1930 the Kallans formulated some prohibitions to be observed by Adi-Dravidas and when the latter disregarded them they resorted to violence to effect their observance.[32]

I shall end this statement of the history, position of untouchables, of the measures taken to counteract untouchability and the reaction to them with an example of people's reaction reported in the daily press, which I trust will give the reader an idea of the difficulties that lie in the path of the achievement of the national objective in this behalf.

When the untouchables of a village in Hamirpur district in U.P. on the orders of their caste panchayat declined to do the scavenging for the village, the other menials and officials of the village community retaliated by refusing their customary services to the untouchables and brought them round to revoke their decision. In the village of Kakori near Lucknow when the barbers refused to shave the untouchables the latter threatened to down brooms. The caste Hindus of Top, a village 18 miles from Kolhapur on the Poona-Bangalore road, resented the action of Government in granting land for cultivation to the local Harijan Co-operative Farming Society and when the grass reared in the land was getting ready they entered fields and destroyed several cartloads of it. The festivities of the colourful event of Dasara in Mysore in 1953 had to be curtailed owing to a dispute between caste Hindu wrestlers and the State Minister for Law on the score of allowing wrestlers of Scheduled Castes to

enter the same arena where the caste Hindu wrestlers were to show their skill and prowess. The latter would not agree to the Minister's permission to Scheduled Caste wrestlers and the Scheduled Castes would not give up their newly won right.[33]

In Agadgaon, a village in Ahmednagar district as a consequence of some altercation between a member of the Scheduled Castes and two caste Hindus, evidently on the score or appropriately respectful behaviour of the former towards the latter in 1955 caste Hindus raided the houses of the members of the Scheduled Castes, seriously injuring thirty of their men and women. When the Bambhis, the hide-cutting caste of Rajasthan, of Mathania, a village near Jodhpur, refused their customary service of removing the dead cattle of the village, caste Hindus organised a social boycott. At Barabanki in U.P. the scavengers sensing the new potentialities decided to have a shave by the village-barbers. The latter hesitated and the former down their brooms in the barbers' quarters but to no purpose. We are told that the attempts at rapprochement of the district authorities did not bear fruit. The Malas of Nelapatla village in Khammam taluka of Hyderabad refused to allow a bridegroom of the Madigas, another Scheduled Caste, to proceed on horseback. There was a serious clash in which even spears were used. When Kaloo Ram, a Brahmin of Halia Kheri, a village in Bhopal and a former sarpanch of the place, participated in an inter-caste dinner, both his castemen and the barbers of the place boycotted him and the panchayat ordered him to pay Rs. 100 for arranging a caste dinner after his purification. Chhita Lala, a Scheduled Caste member when attending the meeting of the village council of Sampla in Baroda, of which he was a member, sat facing the caste Hindu members. The latter felt so insulted at his "insolent" behaviour that they harassed him till he left the village.[34]

When in March 1956 some members of the Scheduled Castes began to draw water from a public well in Jael village in Nagaur district of Jodhpur some Jats attacked them

and beat them off. When the police arrested five of the alleged assailants about 1000 Jats raided the Collector's office at Nagaur. There had to be a lathi charge to disperse the crowd. Five constables and 30 Jats were injured in the fracas. Last May in the village of Umbhrai, about 42 miles from Thana when there was acute shortage of water two social workers who went there to persuade the caste Hindus to allow the members of the Scheduled Castes to draw water from the village well had to return injured in the fight that took place at the well. At Kulasekaranatham, a hamlet about 25 miles from Tirunelveli landlords attacked their Scheduled Caste tenants when the latter attempted to plough certain fields over which they claimed cultivation rights, and later burned 27 houses and 30 hayricks belonging to the Scheduled Castes. Shri Atmaram, the patel of Ranitarai in Balod Tahsil of Raipur district and a Scheduled Caste member, got it proclaimed by the beating of drum that practice of untouchability was an offence under the Act referred to above. The caste Hindus of the place resented his action so much that they harassed him and forced him to leave the village with his family.[35]

As against this long list of anti-Scheduled Castes actions I have been able to garner only one reported case of caste Hindus actively helping their integration. In February last the caste Hindus of the village of Piplaj in Dahegam Taluka of Ahmedabad district went in a procession to the Scheduled Castes quarters and invited their members to draw water from the common well. It is noteworthy that the village was the recipient of the village improvement shield.[36]

As against the solitary public announcement of social equality of the Scheduled Castes I may state my experience gained in the conduct of two investigations which are proceeding. In Haveli taluka of Poona district the dominant class in the village population is either the Maratha or the Mali; and the Mahar, the typical and the large Scheduled Caste of Maharashtra, stands next to them in number. Their children generally attend the common school. They have,

however, separate watering arrangements. In no case is there a common gymnastic or 'tamasha', that is a troupe of ballad singers. These virile social pursuits are followed in separation. Nor even is there a single common group of singers of devotional songs. Wherever such groups exist, they are separate. On the other hand in the villages preponderantly inhabited by Mahadev Kolis who are classed as a Scheduled Tribe in the uplands of the Junnar and Ambegaon talukas of Poona district, Akola taluka in Ahmednagar district and Jawhar taluka in Thana district a different picture presents itself. The Mahars, and much more so the Chamars, are freely allowed to sit in the house and chat. The 'tamashas' organized by the Mahadev Kolis, more often than not, depend for their principal actress on the services of a Mahar boy, the accompanying music invariably being provided by the Mahars. Wherever parties for singing devotional songs are arranged Mahars and Chamars frequently join the Kolis.

1. *Supra.*
2. Loc. cit., V, 8, 13.
3. I, 10, 1-5.
4. V, 24, 1-5.
5. V, 10, 7.
6. Baudhāyana, I, 8; Gautama, IV, 16-18, 28; Vasishṭha, XVIII; cf. Manu, X, 47.
7. Shamasastry's trans., pp. 209-10.
8. Vasiṣtha, XVIII, 3; XXVII, 13; Baudhāyana, I, 8, 9; I, 9, 11; Manu, X, 19, 37-39, 51.
9. Shamasastry's trans., p. 210.
10. Panini, III, 1, 134.
11. Op. cit., X, 51-6.
12. I, 21, 15.
13. *Amba, Uddalaka, Kunala, Khandahala, Cittasambhuta* and *Mātanga Jātakas.*
14. Sachau's trans., vol. I, pp. 101-2.
15. 2nd ed., pp. 152, 161-2.
16. *Rājataraṅgini,* R. S. Pandit's trans. pp. 183-8; Text, IV, 473-77; V, 71-120. 218; VI, 69.
17. *India Census* 1901, vol. I, p. 542.
18. *The Tribes and Castes of Bengal,* 1953, pp. 72, 75
19. Baines, pp. 63, 84-5, 106, 108.
20. Ibid., p. 84.
21. X, 36, 49.

22. *Bengal Census Rep.* 1921, pp. 358, 366.
23. Op. cit., p. 82.
24. Baines, p. 63.
25. vide "asprisyata" in *Jnānakośa* (in Marathi) by S. V. Ketkar.
26. R. G. Bhandarkar's Collected Works, vol. II, p. 491.
27. V. R. Shinde, "*Aprisyatecha Prasna*" (The Problem of Untouchability) (In Marathi) pp. 56-90, 215.
28. Pp. 397-98.
29. Pp. 559-60.
30. *Madras Census Report*, 1901, p. 178; Baines, pp. 71-2.
31. *Madras Memorandum to the Statutory Commission*, pp. 596-98.
32. *India Census Report*, 1931, p. 486.
33. *The Times of India*, 27-7-53; 13-8-53; 7-10-53; 16-10-53.
34. *The Times of India*, 13-1-55; 22-1-55; 29-3-55; 12 & 18-5-55; 19-5-55; 11-11-55.
35. *The Times of India*, 2-3-56; 12-5-56; 20-5-56; 3-7-56.
36. *The Times of India*, 27-2-56.

11

Class and Its Role

"For the last century, but especially in the last fifty years, the world seems to have been invaded, harassed, haunted, terrified, by a nightmare of furies, something like a mediaeval troop of hellequins or harlequins, or a ride of devils, called the 'social classes' ", so observes the philosophic historian, the philosopher, the statesman, Benedetto Croce[1] manifestly referring to the doctrine and practice of class war of recent times. Prof. C. A. Mace in an earlier but penetrating analysis of the psychological foundations of class remarks that the fact of class as a form of human motivation asserts itself mainly in connection with marriage. "It is a much more serious matter if a youth marries out of his class than if he marries a woman of a different nationality or of a different religion".[2] Much more recently another psychologist, Prof. T. H. Pear, brooding over the findings, observations and opinions presented in more than two hundred fifty books and papers relevant to the topic, has found it possible and thought it to be normal to describe to his readers English social differences without any mention of marital practice in relation to class. One of his major conclusions, too, stresses a point which, being very much different from that selected by Prof. Mace, is characteristically social in a much lighter and routine way than marriage. He observes: "I regard the objective and subjective importance of class as diminishing ....; class consciousness and class feeling (in the sense of antagonism) do not necessarily go together. The real test of class-quality [?] is the convivial one: who, if you could afford it, would you naturally entertain in your home, being unsurprised if the invitation were returned, and introduce with pleasure to your friends?"[3] A recent enquiry on social mobility conducted under the supervision of Messrs. Caradog Jones and John Hall included the item of marriage as a rele-

vant feature and Jerzy Berent writing on the data provided by it begins the chapter on social mobility and marriage with the remark: "One of the tests of the openness of social structure is the extent of marriage between persons of different social origins." The custom or practice, if any, whereby a person is expected to seek or seeks his mate in his own class is indifferently designated in his enquiry as 'class endogamy' or 'social endogamy'. Data about the social origins of partners in 5100 marriages are broken up into four class-categories; and it is found that in 44.9 per cent of the marriages husband and wife had come from the same group of social origin. On statistical grounds the percentage is significant and cannot be due to chance.[4] The facts, in so far as they can be taken to be representative, support neither of the subjective valuations of Prof. Mace and Prof. Pear. Marriages in which the wife came from the class immediately below that of the husband's formed 30.6 per cent and those in which she came from the second class below that of her husband's 18.6 per cent. Of the total number of marriages in which marriage with a woman of lower class was possible, that is, leaving out the marriages in which the husband came from the fourth class, the lowest tabulated in the inquiry, in 38.9 per cent the wife came from a class lower than that of her husband. As against this, of the marriages in which marriage with a woman of higher class than that of her husband's was possible, that is, ignoring the marriages in which the husband came from the first class of the enquiry, only 27.3 per cent were such.

Readers of this book must have realized how the contemporary transformation of the old caste system has created a din about castes and their wordy and violent conflicts. They know that the one old feature which the system, though very much modified in other respects, still possesses is endogamy or marriage within the caste. Contemporary British class system bears remarkable likeness to the Indian caste system as it was perhaps in the post-Vedic age and only remotely resembles the present-day caste. The current British class system has evolved out of the preceding estates system, com-

mon in Europe, which was very much like the theoretical Indian caste system of about the end of the Hindu period of Indian history. This likeness has significance for our study.

To bring out this significance and its meaning for the trends of caste it is necessary to appraise in brief the estates-system. In the chapter 'Caste Elements Outside India' I have dealt with some of the features of the estates-system which resembled caste.[5] Here I may state at once that though the similarity is deep there are some significant differences which are best appreciated through a description of the system. The estates recognised by feudal society varied from three to twelve, the more general and frequent number being four.[6] These four standard estates were the nobles, the clergy, the free farmers and the serfs or the villeins. The feudal system was both a matter of law regarding land as well as of social rank. In the caste system, as must have been evident, there was no element of land tenure. On the other hand, in the early stages of caste, and even in its later stages in theory, the great multiplicity of caste-groups was used to be reduced to four or five. Whereas in the caste society the caste of Brahmin, charged with the propagation of learning and religion, was the highest, in the estates society the warriors or nobles, the counterpart of the Kshatriyas, occupied the first rank. Division and differentiation of feudal society was without a scriptural sanction, which on the other hand, was an old buttress of the caste system. This is the most significant difference between the two systems, which is made even more effective by the fact that the clergy, though a blood-estate, were recruited from all classes of society. There was no alternative to such an arrangement in a religious system where the preachers, the clergy, had to die celibate.

Whereas the other estates were closed groups and thus were castes so to say, the estate of the clergy, affording scope for social mobility, held within it the seeds of social transformation, a feature lacking in the caste society from early times. I have pointed out how the Kshatriya, the order of society next in rank to the Brahmin, tried to keep for itself

the right of religious function but ultimately gave up the attempt and raised the banner of religious revolt called Buddhism. It is well known that the attempt failed to achieve anything for the Kshatriya, which order, after the banishment of Buddhism from India, settled down to its status as simply the ruling class, not entitled to meddle with the ministration of religion.

Another distinction between the estates society and caste society lies in the much smaller number of groups and less complexity in their hierarchy and precedence of the former.

Members of different estates could not originally intermarry at all; and later they could at best enter into only a marriage without full rights. Mixed unions were unequal or morganatic marriages. As a contemporary writer of the times observed, the orders or estates were the landmarks which were not to be effaced by marriage. It appears that in extreme cases a person taking a wife from higher rank might have to expiate his egregious act with his life. More often the woman was dragged down to the lower order. On the other hand, a wife taken from the lower estate did not, on marriage, receive the treatment of her husband's order. As regards the children of such unions the principle that they followed the 'worser hand' was in full force. In the style of living and in other ways the nobility was utterly segregated from the other orders. Especially was this true before the rise of towns and the growth of mercantile class. From about the 13th century wealth could purchase some kind of nobility. In the earlier period of the history of this institution there was a theory about the society very much resembling the corresponding theory of the caste society, placing the orders in their right places. The three orders of society were considered to be of divine origin, each one with its special function and duty, the proper discharge of which was an end in itself. The nobility was to defend all, the clergy to pray for all and the commons like the Sudras of the caste system to work and provide food for all. For a man to change his estate was considered to be folly.[7]

Into this highly integrated village life in Britain, by the 13th century, the growth of towns and crafts introduced the trader and merchant class as well as the artisan and the town labourer. By the beginning of the 15th century the picture of British society presents a different aspect from that of the preceding period. And what is most significant for the student of caste, its recent development and its future transformation, is that in place of the caste-like rigidly organized society we find, at least till the middle of the 18th century, a society with social classes more or less fluid and integrated with good fellow-feeling resulting from free commingling of population, which took differential status for granted and showed neither snobbery or hauteur on the one hand nor inferiority complex or sullenness on the other.[8] Its best social orientation is seen almost at the mid-point of the period, from 1400 A.D. to 1800 A.D., during the Elizabethan age.[9] Trevelyan thus records his opinion: "The study of the history and literature of Elizabethan England gives an impression of a greater harmony and a freer intercourse of classes than in earlier or later times. It is not a period of peasants' revolts, of levelling doctrines, of anti-Jacobian fears, or of exclusiveness and snobbery in the upper class such as Jane Austen depicts in a later age. Class divisions in Shakespeare's day were taken as matter of course, without jealousy in those below, or itching anxiety on the part of the 'upper and middling classes' to teach 'the grand law of subordination' to the 'inferior orders', which is so painfully evident, in the Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Centuries." R. H. Tawney, who is no respecter of bourgeois idea of status groups, has touched on a slightly different aspect of the integrated social organization. He remarks that the gentry "held a position determined, not by legal distinctions, but by common estimation. Mere caste had few admirers—fewer probably among the gentry militant of the early seventeenth century than among the gentry triumphant of the early eighteenth."[10]

Hammonds, staunch supporters of the poor and passionate advocates of humanism, accepting the opinion of Hasbach

that every village had its ladder so that nobody was condemned to the lowest rung but had fair opportunity to rise, remark that the picture need not paint the age as one of gold, where no injustice occurred, no tyranny was exercised or no control over the lives of others was desired. It truly presents the fact that "whatever the pressure outside and whatever the bickerings within, it remains true that the common-field system formed a world in which the villagers lived their own lives and cultivated the soil on a basis of independence."[11] The development of commerce and growth of towns threw up new classes of people, the merchants, the artisans and the labourers. The artisans, at least a large bulk of them, soon joined the ranks of wage-earners; and the stresses created by the fact of like interests being not common between the merchants, who alone are properly designated as the Middle Class and who were now attempting to join the ranks of gentry, and the wage-earners, whether artisans or labourers, were severe enough to show cracks in the social structure. The rift in the lute had already occurred. Capital and labour by their opposition had already marred the social harmony enough not to idealize the age of domestic artisanry as one of gold.[12] While this was true, more particularly of the eighteenth century, on the economic plane, the situation on the social side was very much better in spite of the fact that the new titled and landed classes, which had acquired exclusive privileges, had not the same sense of responsibility towards their dependents as the feudal gentry. The new class formed by the merchants had begun to commingle with the old gentry and the younger sons of both took to commerce and the new professions in large numbers. Tawney approvingly refers to the opinion of De Toqueville that England was the only country in which feudalism had not ended in the creation of caste. In Germany till 1731 certain crafts were prohibited to children born in families engaged in particular occupations, while the estates as such came to be abolished only in 1807, some years after the conflagration of the French Revolution.[13]

Mobility and commingling of the classes, though restricted

in practice, in an age of fair plenty and in a society in which the upper class was ancient and in a way responsible, had their effect on the social atmosphere. Though absolute social justice was not established, the safety valves were effective enough to produce a feeling of satisfaction that the situation was generally right and that the adjustments which may be felt to be necessary can be brought about by negotiation and bargaining. No urge or need to raise a violent and armed conflict was felt by the masses, to the chagrin of many a theorist, when the French crowds rose in rebellion against their erstwhile social superiors. This is a phenomenon not only strikingly noticed and noted by contemporary observers but also indirectly commented upon by such a revolutionary theorist as Engels, to whose opinion I shall refer later. Here I shall content myself with the observations of some economic and social historians. Equalitarian Tawney observes: "The contrast between such a picture [where a single community embraced two nations] and contemporary English society was obviously profound. While elsewhere it needed an earthquake to shatter the dungeon, England, long before the evolutionary era had begun, had absorbed into her system some elements in the transformation which the Revolution was to produce."[14] Thus social evolution in an appropriate environment had already partially at least forestalled social revolution. Gretton, who has gone into the differential traits of the upper classes of Britain and France to explain the lack of reaction in the former country, concludes: "In England there always existed, in however strained a condition, a tie of mutual comprehension which was lacking in France.[15] Lipson stresses also the natural superiority of the upper classes, barriers to which were relative, making movement to upper grades easy.[16]

Britain had evolved between 1400 A.D. and 1760 A.D. a resilient social structure based on social classes out of the rigid and almost hereditary estates system which had prevailed for about five or six centuries before. And that system stood the test of such a terrific convulsion as that of the French Revolution, one of the greatest of social wars yet recorded.

The stability of the British social system resulted from the nature of the nobility and the gentry with whom the clergy sided more or less unequivocally. Of the new classes the most important was that of the merchants and traders. And as pointed out above they aspired for the dignity of the gentry and usually secured it. Their share in the social security of the system was not great. They had already begun the great cleavage between capital and labour. But the fact that as yet the mercantile community had not come to occupy the position of supreme importance and that the large concentrations of populations, made possible by machine industry and industrial finance, had not yet taken place saved the situation, though very clear stresses and strains are observable. The composition, and the characteristics of this class as they show themselves must be carefully borne in mind. Its nature when it found full scope, largely contributed to the sharp cleavage of capital and labour as it manifests itself in the 19th century and after.

The trader, the merchant, the entrepreneur, the banker and the financier and later the manufacturer, the industrialist or the factory-owner compose this class which is properly known as the middle class. Gretton studying the rise and growth of the English Middle Class has shown this to be its composition. When the small landowner and the farmer came to be grouped with this middle class towards the end of the 18th century the agrarian outlook had changed to such an extent that the agricultural labourer was only the rural counterpart of the city wage-earner. Sometimes the professions, which suddenly multiplied after the beginning of the 18th century, and the so-called intellectual classes are grouped closely with the main body of the middle class as the professional middle class.

In contemporary phraseology there is an amount of looseness in the use of the term middle class, which as its qualifying term indicates is a class that stands midway. Standing midway is tantamount to having the golden mean. By loose analogy middle class stands for a class that is stable

and goes the middle of the road and is the salt of the social earth. In the social world, where only three classes are envisaged, the middle class, occupying the central position between the extremes of the capitalists and the workers seems to have its raison detre. This is the principal reason why in America between seventy to ninety per cent of the people, when questioned about their class, returned themselves as middle class. Partly this behaviour is due to the prevailing sentiment against class structure itself.[17]

In our country recently people have been protesting against a number of things on behalf of and in the name of the middle class, forgetting the fact that in the history of class society both in origin and in development the middle class stands for the trading, mercantile and commercial groups who are, in socialistic terminology, known as the capitalists and the middle-men. When fairly well paid teachers take up the cudgel against certain tax proposals on behalf of the so-called middle class they have the salaried groups or the salariat in their view. Millionaires voicing the same feelings and views against certain other aspects of the budget in the name again of the middle class, on the other hand, have in view almost wholly the capitalists, the industrialists and entrepreneurs, the proper and historical Middle Class. Sometimes these teachers and such other persons refer to the many groups of the salariat as the middle class or the lower middle class. This confusing and unholy association is partly the result of Marxian sociology which propounds the existence of only two classes.[18]

Whatever the reasons for this grouping it should be forthwith abandoned. The salariat does not own means of production. It lives by selling its service. To that extent it resembles the workers or the proletariat and is distinguished from the capitalists. In tastes, ideas and ideals it has real affinities with both, one at the either end. Like the capitalist class it lives by some kind of brain labour and not like the proletariat by hand-labour. If one section of it is the handmaid of the capitalist, another section of it not only pro-

mulgates anti-capitalist ideas and feelings but supplies a part of the leadership of the proletariat. Its growth during the last two centuries and a half is phenomenal. The economic significance of the class can be gauged from the figures for the net national income of Britain. In 1938 of the estimated total of £4,595 millions, wages accounted for £1,790 millions, profits and interests £1,351 and salaries £1,081 millions. Thus the salariat accounted for nearly 24 per cent of the national income, though in numerical strength it formed about 14 per cent of the gainfully occupied persons. In 1911 the salaries accounted for only 12 per cent of the national income.[19] In 1951 the salaried employees of all grades formed about 25 per cent of the occupied heads of households.[20] Its conditions of service with regular promotions not only create an atmosphere of comparative security but also encourage a planned life. In ideas and ideals too it tends to differ from the capitalists as well as from the wage-earners. Its members should better give up the pernicious habit of describing itself by the term Middle Class, which, in its historical setting, is fairly odious, being the so-called ruling class, the class which must be suppressed by the proletariat, in Marxian sociology.[21]

The historical middle class, composed principally of the traders, merchants and entrepreneurs appears distinctly in British society of the 15th century. Its close connection with money and currency is stressed by Gretton. In its early history it did not show much regard for intellectual work nor any appetite for responsible public work which did not bring in money. More than once in its history till the middle of the 19th century it showed remarkable cleverness in getting its battles fought by other classes. More than once the class exhibited lack of gratitude and loyalty to the class which worked in co-operation, whether it was the upper class or the working class. Its career is singularly marked by absence of consideration for the dependents entrusted to its care.[22]

About the beginning of the 19th century, as the consequence of the agrarian transformation and of the industrial

revolution of the last quarter of the 18th century, the class structure of British society showed a remarkable change. The working class which had grown in volume got more and more isolated from the other sections of society, particularly from the employing class. The phenomenon was so marked that Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield, represented the British community as composed of two nations, the rich and the poor, poised for war, before Marx and Engels promulgated the idea of two classes and their war. The largest share of responsibility for this state of affairs must be credited to the historical Middle Class which now in its upper grade appeared as the industrialists or the manufacturers.[23] Early in the 19th century Robert Owen, an enlightened employer, observed about this class: "The old aristocracy of birth, as I recollect them in my early days, were in many respects superior to the money-making and money-seeking aristocracy of modern times."[24]

Early in its history this class employed some part of its wealth in building splendid cathedrals and churches mostly with mundane purpose. Even Trevelyan, who is rather sympathetic to this class, writing about their characteristics and achievements about the end of the 18th century declares them to be 'Philistines' who had no "use for art or beauty, which were despised as effeminate by the makers of the great factory towns of the North." Ruskin, about the middle of the 19th century, denounced the particular employment of wealth in destroying beauty that was going on around him. And only a few years later, Matthew Arnold in his famous phraseology condemned the upper class, only partially formed by these people, as 'barbarians' and the middle class, preponderatingly comprising them, as 'Philistines'. Its money-mindedness has not unoften led to deterioration of public standards by creating scope for corruption. Gretton dilates on the case of Sir Thomas Gresham. Later, too, when the newly formed parties of the Whigs and the Tories came on the scene, composed as they were either of merchants or of the landlords, not only was the foreign policy moulded with a view to helping trading enterprises but also was adminis-

tration looked upon as "a legitimate source of personal profit."[25]

Today in a number of countries the results of the peculiar combination of vulpine intellect and feline rapacity characterising this class are acutely felt. Past crises, like that brought about by the World War I, if studied carefully, will reveal clear marks of the same combination in this historical Middle Class. It is a far cry from the situation naively described by the author of the Sanskrit religious text, the *Aitareya Brahmana.* He proclaimed the Vaiśya order of his society, which was composed of farmers and merchants, as the one which was 'tributary to another' or 'to be lived upon by another' or 'to be oppressed at will.' Of all the sections of a society this class has shown itself to be the shrewdest and the cleverest in evading taxation, and the low rank assigned to it by old Chinese social thinkers shows better appreciation of its anti-social potentialities.[26]

Marx and Engels, forming their sociology in the second quarter of the 19th century, were so far impressed with the opposition and antagonism characterising the relations between the employers and the employees, the owners of factories and the workers working therein, that they could not clearly see more than two classes in their contemporary European society. Economists of the orthodox school have based their reasoning on the explicit assumption of three classes. Sociologists have distinguished seven, six, five or again three classes.[27]

Classes are not mere occupations or even groups of occuptions, though when certain groupings feel that they are classes it is found that under each only certain specific occupational groups figure. Nor are they mere income groups.[28] The nomenclature current in the early estates system was not only stable but had relation to the particular manner of connection with the then principal means of production, land. Thus the gentry was the class which owned the land, and the serfs or villeins were the class which owed the duty of

cultivating it under certain customary or legal provisions. When with the growth of towns new classes, those of the traders and merchants and of the artisans, arose, there was some confusion or at least hesitation and ambiguity about their proper position in the hierarchy and about their designation. In course of time the artisans, losing control over raw material and means of turning them into the finished products, lost their identity in the general mass of workers or wage-earners. During the same period the merchants, traders and entrepreneurs prospered and multiplied. At each turn a number of them got absorbed in the gentry or the upper class. But a large bulk of them remained distinct and occupied in their money-making business. Gretton has called this class the Middle Class, and I have spoken of it as the historical Middle Class.

The fundamental characteristics of middle class according to Gretton is that "it should be independent—or at least capable of independence—in regard to the circumstances of its life."[29] The feature is met with in the merchants, the industrialists and the entrepreneurs rather than in the so-called middle classes of loose contemporary terminology. Sombart identifies "middle class" with "the representatives of local production and distribution."[30] The characterization of "middle class" by sociologists in America is naturally colourless. MacIver and Page very pertinently remark: "A large proportion of the people on almost all economic and occupational levels and possessing almost all degrees of social prestige say that they are "middle class." This claim, at bottom, is a denial of the existence of any recognizable social stratification in the United States."[31] When economists make use of the scheme of three classes their middle class appears to stand for the middle income-groups. I have shown above that the core of truth in Marxian sociology, viz. that the relation a group bears towards the dominant means of production of an age, has reflected itself in the nomenclature of its class structure. Centers, after an elaborate study of the psychology of classes in American society, where because of the general economic well-being one would not have expected

close connection between economic activity and class consciousness, observes: "A man's way of getting his livelihood dominates much of his working life, and it is out of the forces acting upon him in this economic sphere that class consciousness has been seen to emerge, that it structures itself primarily around the economic self-interest born of status and role and the forces of economic circumstance is a wholly reasonable discovery."[32] The analysis given above is in keeping with these findings and justifies the separate recognition of the salariat from the upper class, the capitalists and entrepreneurs, merchants and shopkeepers, artisans and farmers, and the working class.

The salaried people have not made much din so far. Recently the so-called blackcoated proletariat, the lower grades of clerks and shop assistants and such other people have organized themselves in unions. In 1950 the late Harold J. Laski[33] observed: "Until this last generation the ability of the trade union to attract to its ranks what Americans call the 'white-collar' and Englishmen the 'black-coated' workers was small. Today it is steadily increasing....." Teachers of all grades, more according to the stage of education than the total profession, have been forming their own unions. The professions have for ages been organized. There is as yet no organization trying to bring salaried occupations together. The largest bulk of the intellectuals, who are not a social class in the same sense in which labourers are, belong here. As Schumpeter aptly points out "a great part of their activities consist in fighting each other and in forming the spearheads of class interests not their own."[34] It appears to me that this has been their social role for ages. And that is why though the capitalists have passed from the stage of competition to that of 'trusted' and 'cartelled' co-operation the intellectuals stick to their competitive habit which in their case is nature rather than second nature. In spite of this habit, or perhaps because of it in a stably progressive society like that of Great Britain, though the intellectuals have been recruited from widely differing groups, as Cole maintains,[35] "in comparison with the intellectuals of a century ago, they hold a much

more stable position in the social system."

The estrangement of the working class from the other sections of the society, though not an entirely new phenomenon, has been the dominating fact of social life in the 19th century. Lipson observes that after 1847 a fresh era in the history of English society began which has been scornfully known as the "bagman's millenium", from 'bagman' meaning 'a commercial traveller'. The conflict which appeared to be almost a war between two nations, was so acute that Engels, who with Marx believed in and advocated the preparation for class struggle, or more precisely struggle for power on the part of the labouring class by overthrowing the bourgeoisie, wrote in 1844 the following prophesy, which we know has not come out true. He said: "The middle class dwells upon a soil that is honey-combed, the speedy collapse of which is as certain as a mathematical demonstration. The deep wrath of the whole working class (must) before too long a time goes by break out into a revolution in comparison with which the French Revolution will prove to have been child's play."[36] English society, in the one hundred years that have elapsed since Engel's prophesy, has developed on a line far different from one that leads to a violent conflict. Far from attempting to prove the French Revolution to have been 'child's play' it has tended to stamp it as madman's dance. And the reason is not far to seek. G. M. Trevelyan has provided it in the behaviour of the middle class that governed England. He observes:[37] "The liberal-minded and highly educated governing class of the seventies was more nearly affiliated to the Universities than to the declining aristocracy or the rising plutocracy".

The concept of like interests which are not common brought to the front by MacIver enables one to understand this matter of conflict in the sociological context. Individuals and groups do have some interests which are alike but not common to others. In the attempt of each individual and group to satisfy them there arise some difficulties as the competitors are many. It is a situation of competition which may pass off into one of opposition and further into

that of conflict. But in civilized society quite a number of such situations are settled amicably by certain rules, customary or legal. In the behaviour of groups, however, the situation is not easily met by existing rules, and may take on the aspect of prolonged conflict. The position of working class vis-a-vis the employing class, from time to time in the course of history, deteriorated to such an extent that an explosion alone produced a sort of a solution.

Very very long before Marx and Engels told the world about the need for struggle and conflict between the capitalists and the working class, about 2,200 B.C. there occurred serious riots and rebellion of the Egyptian working people against others, which have left indelible marks even in the scanty literature handed down from that period. We are informed that for a good few years neither property nor life was safe and that there was anarchy in the land. Memphis, the metropolis of Dynastic Egypt, is believed to have suffered eclipse as a result of this rebellion. When order reappeared literature testifies to the sigh of relief that the then Egyptian population heaved.[38] The slave-risings of ancient Rome are well known. Their consequences need not be entered into here. Whereas the Egyptian economy was feudal, later Roman was more of the nature of financial capitalism[39] based on slave-labour.

It is a far cry from Republican or even Imperial Rome to Britain of the 14th century A.D. The tribal and feudal society in its heyday was working efficiently in its own way. And the efficiency like that of the caste system of old must have left hardly any scope for armed risings or revolts. But with changing conditions of the fourteenth century, and even perhaps earlier, social structure began to experience stresses and strains. The scarcity of labour brought about by natural calamities culminated in such demands that the upper classes thought them to be preposterously ruinous. The serfs or villeins were meted out very stringent treatment. The natural consequence of flight to the newly arising towns depleted the already dwindling numbers of the serfs. Slowly the class of landless labourers as well as that of yeoman farmers, the pride of later England, was swelling in numbers

and growing restless. Things came to a head in 1381.[40] And what is called the Peasants' Revolt or the Great Revolt or merely the Rising or again the open rebellion, which is described by Lipson as "the first great conflict between capital and labour", occurred. It was so serious and significant an event that books on political history of England devote some space to it. It was on the verge of being successful but was finally quelled. Its results were on the whole beneficial. The spirit that prompted the rising was mainly responsible for the final disappearance of serfdom from Britain long before it died out on the European continent.

Feudalism gave place to what may be called financial capitalism characterised by the guild and the domestic systems of production. The social structure responded to the economic change and *vice versa;* but the whole behaved, as we have seen, as a harmony of social classes till the middle of the 18th century. The whole period is conspicuous for the absence of any armed or violent conflict of classes. The adjustment of like interests which were not common was mostly achieved through negotiation and some strikes.

With the Industrial Revolution and the closing of the open-fields the era of what is called industrial capitalism was well set. The dominant feature of social structure of the 19th century, strife between capital and labour, was heralded by a rising of labour of some significance. Hammonds, who write about "the blazing ricks in 1830"[41] threatening the ruling class with anguish of the despair of the new labourers, describe it as "last labourers' revolt". Thereafter the strike weapon and finally the political party have been made use of.

Whether there were labour conflicts and consequent upheavals in ancient India we do not know. It is clear from all evidence, literary, contemporary, observational and archaeological, that from about the 6th century B.C. to about the 11th century A.D. Indian economy was based on financial capitalism, though domestic slavery almost everywhere and agrestic serfdom in some parts of the country slightly changed the local and the period aspects of the picture. During all this long period caste system was in force, just as in Egypt for over two thousand years at least feudal serfdom ruled

supreme. Though labour, which was in later times under some kind of state control as the *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya makes clear, did not rise in known revolt, it does not mean that there was perfect social harmony among all the orders. We have seen how the Kshatriya strove against the Brahmin first to retain his right of domestic priestcraft and later to keep himself abreast of intellectual life and religious lore. We also know from some of the conflicts referred to in traditional history that the Brahmin attempted to establish his right to take up arms and to rule. We know from history that he succeeded in doing so. The Brahmin caste provided at crucial moments of Indian history a number of able and famous families or individuals to take up the challenge of anarchy or crisis, to govern and to maintain peace. The Śung dynasty of the 2nd century B.C. is the first of such families. Śātavāhanas, the Vākāṭakas, the Pallavas, the Kadambas, the Śāhi kings of the North-West who bore the brunt of Islamic onslaught, the Senas of Bengal and the last but not the least the Peshwas of Mahārāṣṭra, all continued the tradition down to the end of the 18th century. And the famous Rani of Jhansi, Laxmibai, of the rising of 1857 was only a late offshoot of the Peshwa tradition bringing it down almost to the contemporary period. Hindu society seems to have generally appreciated their services. We have seen that since the beginning of the twentieth century, however, under the fostering care of the British the communal virus became active. The Brahmin non-Brahmin clash of interests has taken on a sullen aspect venting itself on occasions into violent outbreaks. To this opposition of interests on caste lines is added the new clash between workers and employers. Our economy has become mixed with a fair leaven of the industrial capitalism sufficient to set the old clash between landlord and tenant into the new channel of conflicts. So far they have not been violent in the main.

To add to the stresses and strains of a transitional economy and of a social structure in transformation there are the special features of salaried occupations, which in their present form are mostly of recent origin. As it is, even in countries where these occupations have been of a fairly long

duration, recently, there has been a great pressure for entrance thereto. In our country, alternative occupations for certain types of ability being very limited and many of those which are available being rather closed avenues, the children of low-income or non-propertied parents seek entrance only to the salaried occupations. The late clamour for reservation of posts in all Government offices and the recent exacerbation of feelings of certain castes are only the manifestations of the same phenomenon. Social discontent is aggravated by the fact that in a very large majority of the already limited number of big commercial concerns it is common to recruit candidates for salaried appointments from among the caste-fellows of the owners, proprietors, managers and the top-men. Whole offices in a city like Bombay, belonging to even the so-called enlightened people, are found manned by members of particular castes only, generally the same as that of the proprietor or the senior partner. It ought to be borne in upon those in power that even in Britain, where till the middle of the 18th century relations between social classes were fairly cordial, in the make-up of the recent situation of social strife nepotism of businessmen in assigning important posts to their relations and favouritism in filling vacancies with youths of the same social class as themselves have played their part. How much more is it likely to play havoc in a society which is just getting out of the forms of caste and is not able to see its way, having not yet changed its spirit!

All this discussion will have helped the reader to grasp the fact that the recent transformation of caste has proceeded somewhat on the lines of the British social classes without as yet developing the social harmony that existed among them till about the middle of the 18th century. Considering the similarity of caste system with estates system it is but natural that its transformation should install harmonious structure of social classes as was the case with Britain's estates system. But there are certain very disturbing factors which have already brought about exacerbation of feelings and certain others which, if not properly handled in time, will add to it. I have indicated above a number of measures, and hinted at others, calculated to relieve the situation. What is needed is

a clear appreciation of the gigantic nature of the task and conscious and steady endeavour.

The spirit which should guide such endeavour is best conveyed in the following wise words of Sombart[42] written over half a century before. "All social struggle should be determinedly within legal bounds. Thus only can the sanctity of the idea of right remain uninjured. Without this we plunge into chaos. Man must struggle in the name of right against that which he considers wrong, upon the basis of existing right. Man must respect this right because it has become right, and passes for such; and he must not forget that our fathers struggled not less intensely for that right which today we hold, and have had in heart not less enthusiasm than their sons for the right of the future."

1. Op. cit., p. 79.
2. Marshall, pp. 159, 163; cf. Dobb, p. 138.
3. Pear, p. 290.
4. Ibid., pp. 321, 324-5, 326, 328, 344.
5. How close the similarity is may be judged from the fact that thirty-five years ago W. Thompson, the Superintendent of the Bengal Census of 1921, suggested that the proper equivalent of the Sanskrit word 'varṇa' was 'estate'.
(*Report*, p. 345).
6. Adams, pp. 305-306; Huebner, pp. 89-91; Gretton, pp. 14-16; Cox, pp. 125-132; Lipson, pp. 4-9, 15.
7. Huebner, pp. 89-93; Cox, pp. 124 f.n., 140-141.
8. Dobb (1) pp. 248-50; (2), pp. 108, 121; Wingfield-Stratford, pp. 32, 36-7, 39, 49-50, 232, 239; Trevelyan, pp. 162-7, 267-74, 306-310, 359-60, 398-9, 465-8, 477-93.
9. Gretton, pp. 209, 220-221; Tawney, pp. 122-123; Trevelyan, pp. 162-167, 306.
10. Op. cit., pp. 162-165.
11. Trevelyan, p. 165.
12. Op. cit., pp. 9-10.
13. Lipson, pp. 93-108; Gretton, p. 208; Trevelyan, pp. 166-167, 276, 310-11; Tawney, p. 122; Hammonds, pp. 11, 306; Huebner, pp. 97, 107.
14. Op. cit., p. 122.
15. Op. cit., p. 209.
16. Op. cit., pp. 191, 209; Gretton, pp. 220-221.

17. Sombart, pp. 107, 134, 155-58; Gretton, pp. 8, 10, 12, 105, 147, 167, 200, 204, 217-218, 225-226, 230; Lipson, pp. 173-174; Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson — *The Professions*, pp. 289, 295; Trevelyan, p. 392; MacIver & Page, pp. 370, 372 Table XII; cf. Kroeber, p. 269.
18. Sombart, pp. 106-112; Tawney, p. 86; Schumpeter, pp. 15-19; Cole, pp. 87-9.
19. Lipson, p. 443, f.n. 1; Dobb in Marshall, p. 141; Lewis and Maude, p. 21.
20. Cole, p. 153, Table I. This percentage is arrived at by combining the percentages of categories 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 of the middle column and adding two-thirds of the percentage of category 3, one-third being deducted as that of "large employers".
21. Sombart, pp. 94, 95, 96; Engels as quoted in Lipson, p. 249.
This was written in 1950 to separate the historical middle class from other sections which were being grouped with it as the composite middle class. I suggested the appellation of the salariat to designate these groups as separate from the historical middle class. The intensive research in social stratification that has been proceeding in Europe and U.S.A. since then has given us two or three very significant books on the subject. To my mind the American book of Mills, *White Collar*, is the most penetrating contribution so far. What are called 'white collar' people in U.S.A. are generally known in U.K. as 'black-coated' workers. It is gratifying to note that Mills is very definite on separating out all the groups of people that work on salary basis from the usual middle classes, which are dubbed "old middle classes". Mills has computed for his readers the percentages of the various classes of workers in U.S.A. during the seventy-year period 1870-1940. Of "The three broad strata" — "old middle", "new middle class" and "wage-workers"— the percentages in 1870 were 33, 6 and 61 respectively. In 1940 they were 20, 25 and 55 respectively. Thus the 'old middle class' percentage had declined by about 39 per cent and that of the 'new middle class', my salariat, had increased by more than 300 per cent (p. 63). That this new middle class is conscious and capable of organising itself is clear from Mills' data regarding unionism among them. In 1900, 8.2 per cent of the wage-workers and only 2.5 per cent of the white-collar employees were in unions. In 1948, the respective percentages were 44.1 and 16.2. Thus whereas unionism had increased by more than 450 per cent among wage-workers in forty-eight years, it had increased by more than 550 per cent among the white-collar workers (p. 302).
22. Gretton, pp. 109-111, 121-122, 139, 158-159, 174, 191, 208, 210-212, 214-218, 225-226, 231; Lipson, pp. 258-259.
23. Hammonds, pp. 187-191; Gretton, p. 183; Trevelyan, pp. 471-472, 545-546; Lipson, pp. 247-248.
24. Quoted by Lipson, p. 249.

25. Gretton, pp. 85-90; 113-114, 170-171; Trevelyan, pp. 493-494, 557; Matthew Arnold — *Culture and Anarchy*, pp. 13, 22, 36, 50, 61-62, 65, 68.
26. *Vedic Index* (Vaiśya); Latourette, *The Chinese, Their History and Culture*, Vol. I, p. 206; R. Turner, *The Great Cultural Traditions*, Vol. II, pp. 822-824.
27. Sombart, p. 94; Tawney, pp. 86-87; Dobb in Marshall, pp. 136-140; Schumpeter, p. 15; MacIver & Page, pp. 361-364; Cole, p. 87.
28. Dobb, pp. 138-42; Schumpeter, p. 14; Centers, p. 118; Lewis and Maude, pp. 19-20; Mills, pp. 70-76; Glass, pp. 29-31, 58-64; Pear, pp. 21-4; Cole, pp. 2-12.
29. Op. cit., p. 15; Dobb. pp. 308, 312.
30. Op. cit., p. 107
31. Op. cit., p. 370.
32. Op. cit., p. 218.
33. Op. cit., p. 25.
34. Op. cit., p. 146; Mills, pp. 155, 327, 351.
35. Op. cit., p. 70.
36. Lipson, pp. 248, 249, 318.
37. Op. cit., p. 568.
38. R. Turner, *The Great Cultural Traditions*, Vol. I, pp. 301-302, 185-186, 193, 213.
39. This term is taken from Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, pp. 80-81, where he contrasts the 16th century 'financial capitalism' with the 19th century 'industrial capitalism'.
40. Lipson, p. 18; Trevelyan, pp. 11-16.
41. Hammonds, pp. 81, 216, 300; Trevelyan, pp. 471-2.
42. Op. cit., p. 174.

APPENDIX A

PANJAB

Name of Caste (Number of individuals measured is given in parentheses).		Cephalic Index		Nasal Index		Cephalic Length		Cephalic Breadth		Nasal Length		Nasal Breadth	
		M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.
Arora	(27)	72.79	3.8	71.60	5.05	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chuhra	(80)	73.49	2.69	75.29	6.04	186.74	6.15	137.16	4.75	48.06	2.21	36.11	2.45
Gujar	(13)	72.30	2.66	67.37	4.87	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kanet: Kulu	(60)	74.11	2.57	74	5.98	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kanet: Lahoul	(30)	77.48	2.37	66.45	5.53	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Khatri	(60)	74.15	3.02	73.30	6.89	185.72	6.05	137.50	5.24	48.82	2.76	35.70	2.81
Machhi	(19)	72.50	1.82	70.29	5.22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sikh	(80)	72.76	2.92	69.10	6.06	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

M = Mean; St. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

APPENDIX B

UNITED PROVINCES OF AGRA AND OUDH

Name of Caste (Number of individuals measured is given in parentheses).	Cephalic Index		Nasal Index		Cephalic Length		Cephalic Breadth		Nasal Length		Nasal Breadth	
	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.
Bania (80)	72.02	3.36	80.55	9.28	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Babhan (26)	73.52	2.25	73.60	7.24	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bhar (100)	73.66	3.06	81.97	8.59	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brahmin (100)	73.29	3.12	74.88	8.02	187.56	5.58	137.42	4.60	46.57	3.04	34.72	2.70
Chamar (100)	72.90	2.92	86.52	7.64	185.18	5.79	134.98	4.21	41.02	2.75	35.19	2.20
Chhatri (100)	73.12	3.12	78.36	7.70	188.35	6.51	137.68	4.60	45.80	3.76	35.65	2.52
Dom (100)	74.28	3.54	83.60	8.86	183.91	6.63	136.40	4.49	45.44	3.47	37.72	2.65
Kayasth (100)	72.48	2.99	78.87	8.22	186.62	5.75	135.42	4.91	44.66	3.19	34.99	2.54
Khatri (15)	71.98	2.71	79.15	9.29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kol (32)	72.51	2.96	82.39	7.42	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kurmi (100)	73.25	3.23	79.46	8.38	184.05	6.21	135.13	4.12	44.02	2.95	34.84	2.56
Lohar (45)	72.93	3.34	83.45	11.43	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Musahar (18)	74.29	2.94	86.17	7.84	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pasi (100)	72.68	3.21	85.92	9.11	185.10	6.89	134.48	3.87	41.26	3.21	35.23	2.28

M = Mean; St. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

APPENDIX C

BIHAR

Name of Caste (Number of individuals measured is given in parentheses).	Cephalic Index		Nasal Index		Cephalic Length		Cephalic Breadth		Nasal Length		Nasal Breadth	
	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.
Babhan (59)	76.98	3.66	73.55	7.02	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bind (13)	73.68	3.64	82.76	7.68	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brahmin (67)	74.91	3.02	73.24	6.35	187.88	6.27	140.81	4.74	49.33	3.53	36.11	2.54
Dom: Maghaya (100)	76.21	3.25	82.58	6.98	186.37	6.29	142.20	4.26	48.04	3.09	39.62	2.42
Chamar (62)	76.26	4.35	82.93	7.20	184.42	7.28	140.35	5.28	46.08	2.90	38.13	2.52
Kurmi (71)	75.82	3.50	79.04	6.96	186.97	6.67	141.55	4.54	47.66	3.46	37.45	2.42
Musahar (77)	75.79	2.91	89.20	8.86	183.17	5.91	138.69	4.18	45.52	3.01	40.40	2.97

M = Mean; St. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

APPENDIX D

BENGAL

Name of Caste (Number of individuals measured is given in parentheses).		Cephalic Index		Nasal Index		Cephalic Length		Cephalic Breadth		Nasal Length		Nasal Breadth	
		M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.
Brahmin	(100)	78.89	3.63	70.89	6.85	181.76	5.82	143.25	4.54	49.71	4.09	35.09	2.72
Chandal	(67)	78.11	4.04	74.27	6.83	183.31	6.94	143.18	4.52	49.69	2.69	36.79	2.88
Kayasth	(100)	78.30	3.82	70.78	6.34	182.47	6.08	142.88	4.95	50.19	3.09	35.39	2.52
Koibart	(100)	77.57	3.85	76.68	6.70	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Muchi	(27)	77.22	3.55	75.30	6.92	182.93	6.76	142	4.45	49.19	2.94	36.89	2.66
Rajbansi	(100)	75.36	3.21	76.86	5.81	186.28	6.85	140.26	5.15	48.96	2.85	37.57	2.52
Sadgop	(48)	77.95	3.23	74.24	7.46	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

M = Mean; St. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

APPENDIX E

BOMBAY

Name of Caste (Number of individuals measured is given in parentheses).	Cephalic Index		Nasal Index		Cephalic Length		Cephalic Breadth		Nasal Length		Nasal Breadth	
	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.
Bhil: Khandesh (103)	72.56	3.04	95.80	11.84	182.92	6.11	132.61	4.43	41.12	3.49	39.05	3.14
Chitpavan Brahmin (100)	77.41	3.95	76.99	6.60	186.43	7.37	144.25	5.16	49.34	3.26	37.87	2.15
Deshasth Brahmin (100)	77.09	4.37	79.73	6.14	185.5	6.39	142.94	5.41	48.93	2.91	38.81	2.25
Katkari (109)	74.37	2.65	88.46	8.05	178.86	6.20	133.04	3.95	44.04	2.94	38.78	2.49
Kunbi (100)	77.52	4.36	79.44	5.70	180.10	6.35	139.49	5.55	47.81	2.62	37.95	2.09
Mahar (100)	77.17	3.55	82.23	6.20	181.40	5.83	140.12	5.15	47.21	2.58	38.73	2.37
Maratha (High Caste) (100)	76.34	4.11	71.47	6.35	184.62	6.39	140.92	6.52	52.02	3.37	37.01	2.44
Maratha Ghati (100)	78.33	4.53	80.32	7.47	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nagar Brahmin (100)	79.93	4.33	73.58	7.66	184.51	7.47	147.16	5.97	50.76	3.56	37.18	2.57
Prabhu (100)	80.00	3.80	76.18	7.13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Shenvi Brahmin (100)	79.08	4.06	75.15	7.46	186.22	7.18	147.15	5.29	50.27	3.63	37.62	2.36
Son Koli (100)	77.62	3.24	76.77	6.96	185.00	5.83	143.45	4.71	49.62	3.15	37.98	2.62
Vani (Gujarat) (139)	78.52	3.46	76.30	8.09	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

M = Mean; St. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

APPENDIX F

MADRAS

Caste		Language	Cephalic Index		Nasal Index	
			M.	St. Dev.	M.	St. Dev.
Kapu	(49)	Telugu	78.08	3.70	—	—
Smarta Brahmin	(60)	Canarese	78.45	4.41	—	—
Coorg	(32)	Kodagu	79.72	3.79	72.12	5.22
Billava	(50)	Tulu	80.36	4.40	—	—
Sivalli	(40)	,,	80.44	5.21	—	—
Vakkaliga	(50)	Canarese	81.76	5.03	—	—
Toda	(76)	Toda	73.36	2.22	—	—
Yeruva	(25)	Canarese	73.48	3.06	89.76	5.26
Vellal	(40)	Tamil	73.92	2.74	—	—
Nayar	(39)	Malayalam	74.44	2.85	—	—
Pattar Brahmin	(25)	Tamil	74.44	3.31	—	—
Tamil Brahmin	(40)		76.55	3.44	—	—

M = Mean; St. Dev. = Standard Deviation.

APPENDIX G

DIFFERENTIAL INDEX

(Based on six characters: Cephalic index, cephalic length, cephalic breadth, nasal index, nasal length, and nasal breadth)

PANJAB

Chuhra and Khatri	.88

UNITED PROVINCES

Brahmin and Chhatri	.89
„ „ Kayasth	1.47
„ „ Kurmi	1.83
„ „ Dom	2.56
„ „ Pasi	3.17
„ „ Chamar	3.32
Pasi and Chamar	.27
Kurmi and Chamar	1.71

BIHAR

Brahmin and Kurmi	1.75
„ „ Chamar	2.42
„ „ Dom	2.95
Chamar and Kurmi	1.45

BENGAL

Brahmin and Kayasth	.43
„ „ Chandal	1.11

BOMBAY

Deshasth Brahmin and Son Koli	.95
„ „ „ Chitpavan Brahmin	1.02
„ „ „ Mahar	1.61
„ „ „ Kunbi	1.73
„ „ „ Shenvi Brahmin	2.10
„ „ „ Nagar Brahmin	2.59
„ „ „ High Caste Maratha	2.64

GENERAL

U. P. Kurmi and Bihar Kurmi	3.49
U. P. Chamar and Bihar Chamar	4.01
U. P. Brahmin and Panjab Chuhra	1.02
„ „ „ „ Khatri	1.38
„ „ „ Bihar Brahmin	2.05
„ „ „ Chitpavan Brahmin	3.66
„ „ „ Deshasth Brahmin	3.94
Bengal Brahmin and Shenvi Brahmin	2.30
„ „ „ Chitpavan Brahmin	2.44
„ „ „ Bihar Brahmin	2.52
„ „ „ Deshasth Brahmin	2.96
„ „ „ U. P. Brahmin	3.89

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Abram, A.	..	*Social England in the Fifteenth Century*, 1909.
Adams, G. B.	..	*Civilization during the Middle Ages*, 1910.
Altekar, A. S.	..	*A History of Village Communities in Western India*, 1927.
Āpastamba	..	*Dharmasūtra*, (Bühler's trans, in SBE., 1879).
Arthaśāstra	..	(1) Ed. by R. Shama Sastri, 1919. (2) Translation by R. Shama Sastri (2nd ed.).
Ashley, W. G.	..	*An Introduction to Economic History*, Vol. I, Pt. i, 1888.
Attenborough, F. L.	..	*The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, ed. and trans. by F. L. Attenborough, 1922.
Baden-Powell, B. H.	..	*The Indian Village Community*, 1896.
Baines, Athelstane	..	*Ethnography (Castes and Tribes)*, 1912.
Bashford, J. W.	..	*China, an interpretation*, 1916.
Baudhāyana	..	*Dharmasūtra*, (Bühler's trans. in SBE., 1882).
Bengal Census, 1921	..	*Census of India*, 1921, *Bengal Report.*
Bevan, E.	..	*History of Egypt, Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 1927.
Bhattacharya, J.	..	*Hindu Castes and Sects*, 1896.
Blunt, E. A. H.	..	*The Caste System of Northern India*, 1931.
Bose, P.	..	*A History of Hindu Civilization during British Rule*, Vol. II, 1894.
Breasted, J. H.	..	(1) *A History of Egypt*, ed. 1916. (2) *Ancient Times*, 1917.
Briggs, G. W.	..	*The Chamārs*, 1920.
Brinkley, Capt. F.	..	(1) *Oriental Series*, 11 Vols., 1902 ff. (2) *Japan*, 3 Vols., China, Vol. I, etc., 1902 ff.
Brissaud, J.	..	(1) *A History of French Private Law*, trans. by R. Howell, 1912. (2) *A History of French Public Law*, trans. by J. W. Garner, 1915.
Brooks, B. Allard	..	*A Contribution to the Study of the Moral Practices of Certain Social Groups in Ancient Mesopotamia*, 1920.
Cambridge History of India	..	Vol. I, *Ancient India*, edited by E. J. Rapson, 1922.
Centers, R.	..	*The Psychology of Social Classes*, 1949.
Chadwick, H. M.	..	*Studies on Anglo-Saxon Institutions*, 1905.
Chamberlain, B. H.	..	*Things Japanese*, 1905.
Chanda, R.	..	*The Indo-Aryan Races*, 1916.
Cole, G. D. H.	..	*Studies in Class Structure*, 1955.
Collection of Smrtis	..	Smṛtīnām samuccaya, ed. Anandasram Samskrit Series, No. 48, 1905.

Cox, O. C.	..	*Caste, Class and Race*, 1948.
Croce, B.	..	*My Philosophy*, 1949.
Crooke, W.	..	(1) *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*, 4 Vols, 1896. (2) *Natives of Northern India*, 1907.
Dasgupta, T. C.	..	*Aspects of Bengali Society*, 1935.
Dhalla, M. N.	..	*Zoroastrian Civilization*, 1922.
Dill, Sir Samuel	..	(1) *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1905. (2) *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire*, 1910.
Dobb, Maurice	..	(1) *Capitalist Enterprise and Social Progress*, 1925. (2) *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*, 1946.
Douglas, R. K.	..	*Society in China*, 1894.
Duff, A. M.	..	*Freed Men in the Early Roman Empire*, 1928.
Dutt, N. K.	..	*Origin and Growth of Caste in India*, 1931.
Eliot, Sir Charles	..	*Hinduism and Buddhism*, 3 Vols., 1921.
Ency. of R. and E.	..	*Encycloœdia of Religion and Ethics.*
Erman, A.	..	*Life in Ancient Egypt*, trans. by H. M. Tirard, 1894.
Featherman, A.	..	(IIb), *Social History of the Races of Mankind* (Second Division), *Oceano-Melanesians*, 1888. (V) ibid., (Fifth Division), *Aramœans*, 1881.
Fick, R.	..	*Social Organization in North-East India in Buddha's Time* (trans. by Maitra), 1920.
Forbes, A. K.	..	*Rāsa Māla*, 2 Vols., 1856, ed. by Rawlinson, 1924.
Forbes, James	..	*Oriental Memoirs*, 1934.
Friedländer, Ludwig	..	*Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, (trans. of the 7th ed.), 1909.
Gautama	..	*Dharmasūtra*, (Bühler's trans. in SBE., 1879).
Geer, R. M.	..	*Rome*, 1940.
Ghurye Felicitation Volume	..	ed. by K. M. Kapadia, 1954.
Ghurye, G. S.	..	(1) *Indian Sadhus* (1954). (2) *Family & Kin in Indo-European Culture*, (1955).
Ginsberg, M.	..	*Studies in Sociology*, 1932.
Glass, D. V.	..	*Social Mobility in Britain*, 1954.
Godavari Dist. Gaz.	..	*District Gazetteer of Godavari*, pt. I.
Gretton, R. H.	..	*The English Middle Class*, 1917.
Haddon, A. C.	..	*The Wanderings of Peoples*, 1919.

Hamilton, Walter .. *A Geographical Description of Hindostan*, 2 Vols., 1820.

Hammonds, J. L. and Barbara .. *The Village Labourer*, ed. 1920.

Hemādri .. *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (Bibl. Ind.), 1871 ff.

Hobhouse, L. T. .. *Morals in Evolution*, ed. 1923.

Hose, C. and McDougall, W. .. *The Pagan Tribes of Borneo*, 2 Vols., 1912.

Huebner, R. .. *A History of Germanic Private Law* (trans., 1918).

Hultzsch, E. .. *South-Indian Inscriptions*, (ed. and trans., 1890 ff.).

India Census, 1921 .. *Census of India*, 1921, *India Report*.

Irving, B. A. .. *The Theory and Practice of Caste*, 1853.

Jastrow, Morris (Jr.) .. *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1915.

Johns, C. H. W. .. *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts and Letters*, 1904.

JASB. .. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.*

JBBRAS. .. *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

JRAI. .. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute.*

JRAS. .. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

Kanakasabhai, Pillai V. .. *The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago*, 1904.

Keane, A. H. .. *Man Past and Present*, 1920.

Kerr, James .. *The Domestic Life, Character, and Customs of the Natives of India*, 1865.

Ketkar, S. V. .. *History of Caste in India*, 1909.

Kikani, L. T. .. *Caste in Court*, 1912.

Kitts, Eustace J. .. *A Compendium of the Castes and Tribes found in India*, 1885.

Kroeber, A. L. .. *Anthropology*, 1948.

Lambert, J. Malet .. *Two Thousand Years of Guild Life*, 1891.

Laski, H. J. .. *Trade Unions in New Society*, (1950).

Latthe, A. B. .. *Memoirs of His Highness Shri Shahu Chhatrapati, Mahārāja of Kolhapur*, 1924.

Latourette, K. S. .. *The Chinese, Their History and Culture*, 2 Vols., 1934.

Leage, R. W. .. *Roman Private Law*, 1906.

Leffingwell, G. W. .. *Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence*, 1918.

Lewis, R. and Maude, A. .. *The English Middle Classes*, 1949.

Lipson, E. .. *The Growth of English Society*, 1949.

Logan, W. .. *Malabar*, 3 Vols., 1887.
Longford, J. H. .. *Japan of the Japanese*, 2nd ed., 1915.
Louis .. *Ancient Rome at Work*, 1927.
Lowie, R. H. .. *Primitive Society*, ed. 1949.
Mbh. .. *Mahābhārata* (Kumbhakonam ed.).
MacIver, R. M. .. *Community*, ed. 1920.
MacIver and Page .. *Society*, 1949.
Madras Census, 1871 .. *Census of India*, 1871, *Madras Report.*
Malcolm, Sir John .. *Memoir of Central India and Malwa*, 1823.
Mandlik, V. N. .. *Vyavahāra Mayūkha*, ed. 1880.
Mann, H. H. and Kanitkar, N. V. .. *Land and Labour in a Deccan Village*, No. 2, 1921.
Manu .. *Laws of Manu* (Bühler's trans. in SBE., 1886)
Marshall, T. H. .. *Class Conflict and Social Stratification*, 1938.
Martin, R. M. .. *The History . . . and Statistics of Eastern India*, 3 Vols., 1838.
Maspero, Sir Gaston .. *The Dawn of Civilization*, 5th ed., 1910.
Matthai, John .. *Village Government in British India*, 1915.
Mayne, J. D. .. *A Treatise on Hindu Law and Usage*, ed. 1914.
McCrindle .. *Ancient India.*
Mills, C. Wright .. *White Collar*, 1951.
Möllendorff, P. G. .. *The Family Law of the Chinese*, 1896.
Mookerji, Radhakumud .. *Local Government in Ancient India*, 1919.
Muir, J. .. *Original Sanskrit Texts*, Vol. I (2nd ed.), 1872.
Muirhead, J. .. *Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome* (3rd ed.), 1916.
Mysore Census, 1901 .. *Census of India*, 1901, *Mysore Report.*
Nārada Smṛti ... Jolly's trans. in SBE., 1889.
Nesfield, J. C. .. *Brief View of the Caste System of the North Western Provinces and Oudh*, 1885.
North, C. C. .. *Social Differentiation*, 1926.
O'Malley, L. S. S. .. *Indian Caste Customs*, 1932.
Pandian, T. B. .. *Indian Village Folk*, 1898.
Panjab Census, 1911 .. *Census of India*, 1911, *Panjab Report.*
Panjab Census, 1921 .. *Census of India*, 1921, *Panjab Report.*
Parāsara .. *Parāsara Dharma Saṁhitā* (B.S.S.), 1893-1918.
Patanjali .. *Vyākaraṇamahābhāshya* (B.S.S.).
Pear, T. H. .. *English Social Differences*, 1955.
Petrie, Sir W. M. Flinders .. *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, 1923.
Phooley .. By P. S. Patil (Marathi), 1927.
Polock and Maitland .. *The History of English Law*, Vol. I, (ed. 1911).
Ranade, M. G. .. In JBBRAS, Vol. XX.
Renard, G. F. .. *Guilds in the Middle Ages* (trans., 1919).
Rickards, R. .. *India*, 2 Vols., 1829-32.

Risley, Sir H. H.	..	(1) *Tribes and Castes of Bengal, Ethnographic Glossary*, 1891. (2) *The People of India* (2nd ed., 1915).
Rivers, W. H. R.	..	*The History of Melanesian Society*, 2 Vols., 1914.
Russell, R. V.	..	*The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces*, 4 Vols., 1916.
SBE.	..	*Sacred Books of the East*, 1879.
Schaeffer, H.	..	*The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites.*
Schumpeter, J. A.	..	*Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, ed. 1947.
Senart, E.	..	*Caste in India*, (trans., 1930).
Sherring, M. A.	..	*Hindu Tribes and Castes*, 1872.
Sircar, D. C.	..	*Select Inscriptions*, 1942.
Slater, Gilbert,	..	*Some South Indian Villages*, 1918.
Smith, J. Toulmin	..	*English Guilds*, 1870.
Smith, W. Robertson	..	*Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (ed., 1903).
Sombart	..	*Socialism*, 1898.
Spence, L.	..	*Mexico of the Mexicans*, 1917.
Spencer, Herbert	..	*Principles of Sociology*, Vol. III (ed. 1897).
Steele, Arthur	..	*The Law and Custom of Hindu Castes*, 1868.
Śūdrakamalākara	..	By Kamalākarabhaṭṭa (Nirnayasagar P. ed., 1928).
Sukranīti	..	Trans. by Benoy Kumar Sarkar, 1914.
Tawney, R. H.	..	*Equality*, 1931.
Thurston, E.	..	*Tribes and Castes of Madras*, 7 Vols., 1907-9.
Traill, H. D.	..	*Social England*, Vol. I, 1898.
Travancore Census, 1921		*Census of India*, 1921, *Travancore Report.*
Trevelyan, G. M.	..	*English Social History*, 1944.
Trichonopoly Dist. Gaz.	..	*District Gazetteer of Trichinopoly*, pt. I.
Tucker, T. G.	..	*Life in the Roman World of Nero & St. Paul*, (ed. 1924).
U. P. Census, 1901	..	*Census of India*, 1901, *North Western Provinces & Oudh Report.*
Vad, G. C.	..	*Selections from the Satara Raja's and the Peshwa's Diaries.*
Vaidya, C. V.	..	*History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, 3 Vols., 1921 ff.
Vasishṭa	..	*Dharmasūtra* (Bühler's trans. in SBE., 1882).
Vedic Index	..	By A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith, 2 Vols., 1912.
Vishṇu	..	*Institutes of Vishnu* (Jolly's trans. in SBE., 1880).

Warde Fowler .. *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*, ed. 1929.

Werner, E. T. C. .. (1) *Spencer's Descriptive Sociology*, No. IX, 1910.
(2) *China of the Chinese*, 1919.

Westermarck, E. A. .. *History of Human Marriage*, 5th ed., 3 Vols., 1921.

Wilkinson, Sir J. G. .. *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, new ed., 3 Vols., 1878.

Williams, M. W. .. *Social Scandinavia in the Viking Age*, 1920.

Wilson, John .. *Indian Caste*, 2 Vols., 1877.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esme .. *The Victorian Tragedy*, (1930)

Woolley, C. Leonard .. *The Sumerians*, 1928.

Yājñavalkya .. *Yājñavalkyasmrti*, with Mitāksarā, ed. by S. S. Setlur, 1912.

Zweig, Stefan .. *Brazil* (Eng. trans., 1942).

INDEX

A

Abhīraṣ, tribe, 63, 76.
Aborigines, Aboriginal castes, Aboriginal tribes, 32, 33, 51, 52, 53, 120, 123 ;
exclusion of, 175 and Sudra, 175.
Abul Fazal, castes in time of, 110.
Agamudaiyan, caste, 126, 134 .
Āgri, caste, 32.
Aheriya, caste, 4.
Ahir, caste, 4, 32, 34, 36, 37, 110, 176.
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa : warning to Kshatriyas, 45 ;
on the importance of Purohita, 46 ;
on the low birth of Kavasha, 48 ;
on the position of a Vaiśya, 50, 279.
Ajātaśatru, philosopher-king, 49.
Akbar, castes in time of, 16.
Al-Biruni, 110, 250.
Alpine Race, 129, 137, 138.
Ambattha, Brahmin student, 70.
Ambedkar, Dr. B. R. 226.
Aṅgīras, Smṛti, 97.
Anglo-Saxon, 154, 173.
Antyajas, 98, 250, *see* Outcaste.
Apapātra, 81, 98.
Āpastamba, Dharma Sūtra, 57, 60, 62, 65, 79, 80, 81.
Arabs, absence of endogamy among, 152.
Arjuna, 66.
Arnold, Matthew, on middle class, 278.
Arora, tribe, 32.
Arthaśāstra, 95, 285, *see* Kautilya.
Artisan castes of Madras : struggle for higher social status, 6 ; non-Brahmin priests of, 13.
Ārya, contrast with Dāsa, 46, 51 ; illicit unions with Śūdra, 51, 52, 53 ;
contrast with Śūdra, 59 ;
invasion of India by, 119 ;
opposition of Dāsa to, 166, 175.
Aryan, people, 119. 120, 121, 123, 128, 138.
Aryans, of the Gangetic plains, 175.
Ārya Samāj : attitude towards caste, 200 ;
reasons for the popularity of, 200.
Aryan type, 120, 128.
Āryāvarta, 89.
Aryo-Dravidian type, 128, 135.
Asat Śūdra, 92, 93, 94, 102.
Ashrafin, 19.
Aspṛśya Śūdra, 8.
Aśvapati, philosopher-king, 49.
Atri, Smṛti, 94, 98, 99.
Australians, 132.
Āyogava, mixed caste, 52.

B

Bachgoti, caste, 110.
Backward classes, 191.
Bagri, caste, 110.
Bahaliya, Baheliya, caste, 4.
Bahurupi, caste, 107.
Baines, Sir A. 1, 17, 251.
Balija, caste, 106.
Bālisika, caste, 84.
Bāṇa, on Chaṇḍāla, 98 ; Pāraśava brothers, 101.
Bania, caste, divisions and sub-divisions of, 18, 110 ;
occupational nature of, 31 ;
territorial sub-castes of, 35 ;
physical affinity of, 178.
Bansphor, caste, 7, 32.
Baoriya, caste, 110.

Bārai, caste, endogamous sub-divisions of, 34, 36.
Barber, caste, 9, 10, 25, 26, 32, 79, 83.
as match-maker and marriage priest, 26.
Barbosa, Duarte, on castes in Malabar, 110.
Bārhai, caste, seven sub-castes of, 20.
Bāri, caste, 32.
Basor, caste, 7, 36, 41.
Basu, B. N., efforts to liberalize marriage law, 188.
Baudhāyana, Dharma Sūtra, 78, 79, 81, 84, 85, 86.
Beaconsfield, Lord, 278.
Berad, Caste, sub-castes of, 40.
Berent, Jerzy, 269.
Bevan, Edwyn, on Romans and Egyptians, 170.
Bhadralok, 19.
Bhagavadgītā, Gītā : assurance of salvation to Vaiśya and Śūdra, 63; duties and functions of four castes, 65.
Bhaṇḍāri, caste, 2, 5, 34.
Bhangi, caste, 7, 33.
Bhātiā, caste, ethnic origin of, 32.
Bhil, tribe, 32, 34, 98, 110, 138.
Bhilāla, caste, 35.
Bhīshma, discipleship of Paraśurāma, 68.
Bhuiyār, caste 4.
Bhulia, caste, nickname origin of, 33.
Bisen, caste, 110.
Bishnois, caste, Sectarian origin of, 33.
Blacksmith, caste, 51, 89, 97, 108.
Borradaile, H., a Bombay Officer, 185.
Brāhmaṇas, 43.
Brahmanic civilization 22, 175, 178, 179.
Brahmin Government of Poona, 5 ; *see* Peshwas.
Brahmins, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 31, 34, 35, 36, 40, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 186, 187, 191, 197, 201, 203, 205, 206, 209, 211, 212, 213, 214, 232, 233, 241, 249, 251.
absence of caste-councils, 3 ;
attitude towards other castes, 46, 47, 56, 58, 179 ;
dynasties, 285 ;
exclusive right of priestcraft, 13, 15, 48, 56 ;
food restrictions for, 5, 7, 8 ;
in Malabar, 17 ;
marriage among, 48, 50. 62, 63, 85, 86, 180 ;
occupations of, 15, 16, 82, 83. 100, 106, 209 ;
privileges of, 13, 14, 46, 47, 58, 59 ;
quarters, 96 ;
revolt against the supremacy of, 6, 64, 67, 68, 184 ;
saints, 104 ;
sole receiver of gifts, 57, 89 ;
supremacy over Kshatriyas, 56, 57.
Brahmo Samaj : inclusion in Hindu Society, 188 ; aims of, 199.
Brazil, 150.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad. on Paulkasas, 52.
Bṛhadyama, Smṛti, classification of Śūdras by, 94.
British rule, and caste, 184ff ; and education, 184.
Bryce, James, 235.
Buchanan, C., 16.
Buddha ; assertion of Kshatriya preeminence by, 69 ;
discussion with Ambaṭṭha, 70 ;

previous births of, 70, 71 ;
attitude towards caste, 70, 71 ;
Buddhism, Buddhistic religion, 64. 69, 72, 271.
Buddhistic literature, 43, 69, 70, 78, 83.
Buddhist revolt, 93.
Bunkar, caste, 32
Buruḍ, caste, 107 ; *see* Cane-worker.

C

Cane-worker, caste, 97, 98.
Carpenter, caste, 12, 20, 32, 79, 80. 89, 97.
Caste : method of abolition of, 220, 221, 233, 234, 235, 237 etc.
animosity 217 ;
associations of, 216, 235 ;
autonomy of, 185 ;
and British interest, 198 ;
British policy with regard to. 184ff :
and census, 192, 193 ;
change of, 89 ;
as channel of charity, 211, 212.
and city life, 208 ;
and civil law, 185 :
contrast with class, 2 ;
deities of, 4 ;
disabilities of, 9, 10, 11, 12 ;
endogamy of, 17, 18, 19, 21, 84-87 etc ;
food restriction of, 6, 7, 8 ;
and Indian National Congress, 223, 229 ;
gradations of, 5, 6 ;
intermarriage, 18, 21, 84-88, 95. 100, 101 ;
lack of choice of occupation, 15. 209, 210 ;
in Malabar, 110 ;
based on nicknames, 33 ;
based on occupations, 31, 32, 37, 100 ;
origin of, 64, 178, 179 ;
patriotism, 222 ;
and poor-relief, 213, 214 ;
privileges of, 10, 185 ;
in Panjab, 195 ;
revival of spirit of, 105, 222 ;
revolt against, 188 ;
and scholarships, 212 ;
based on sect, 33, 39 ;
segregation of, in modern cities, 211, 212 ;
social intercourse of, 6, 7, 8, 9, 21, 25, 96 ;
solidarity of, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 95, 184, 195, 223, 230 ;
based on names of tribes, 32 ;
based on territory, 34.
Caste-Disabilities-Removal Act, 187.
Caste patriotism, 211, 214, 222, 233. 236.
Celts, 173.
Census Reports, and revival of caste spirit, 192, 193.
Centers, 280.
Ceremonial purity, 242.
Chāhamāna, caste, 101
Chākkiliyan, caste, segregation of. 10.
Chamār, Chāmbhār, caste, 2, 7, 11, 16, 25, 32, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 177. 249, 253, 254.
Chandal, caste, 125, 135
Chaṇḍāla, 52, 53, 64, 65, 70, 80, 81, 82, 87, 89, 95, 98, 99, 106, 243, 244, 245, 246, 249, 250, 251, etc.
origin of, 52, 53.
Chandel, caste, 110.
Chandragupta, Śūdra origin of, 63.
Chapekar, Mr. N. G., 238.
Chāraṇ, caste, 35.
Charudatta, pursuit of Vaisya's occupation by, 99.
Chasa, caste, 125.
Chatfield, concessions in fees to backward castes by, 190.
Chelmsford, Lord, 191, 201.
Chero, tribe, 4.
Cheruman, caste, 126.

Chetti, caste, 31.
Chhatri, caste, 120, 121, 124, 176, 177.
Chitpavan Brahmins : physical affinities with Deshasth Brahmins, 122, 136.
green—grey eyes of, 138.
see Konkanasth Brahmins.
Chuhra, 120, 121, 176.
Class, 268ff ;
European, 269, 270, 272, 273, 274, 275 etc.
Clean Śūdars, 14.
Colebrooke, H. T., on diversity of occupations of castes, 17.
Communal representation, 202, 204.
Confucius, division of people into five classes by, 147.
Co-operative housing, and caste, 212.
Coppersmith, caste, 12.
Croce, on class, 268.
Crooke, W., 117, 123.
Cross cousin marriage, 131, 132.

D

Dahā, 166.
Dāna-stutis, 89.
Dangi, tribe, 33.
Darius, 128.
Darji, caste, 35.
Dāsa : contrast with Ārya, 46, 51.
merging into Śūdra and Nishāda classes, 53.
opposition between Ārya and, 166.
Daśapura, caste, 110.
Daśaratha, Śūdra, wife of, 63, 88.
Dasyu, 61, 90.
Dayānand Swami, 200.
Depressed classes : residence of, 10;
horn as a distinguishing mark of, 11 ;
disappearance of segregation in schools, 189 ;
special representation in local and legislative bodies, 190 ;
entry into Hindu temples, 194 ;
and missionaries, 207 ;
problem of, 206.
Deśastha Brahmins : devotion to secular pursuits of, 16.
territorial derivation of, 35.
sub-castes of, 39, 40.
physical affinities of, 122, 125.
Devāpi, 48.
Dhangar, caste, 25, 36, 38, 41, 136.
Dharkār, caste, 7, 32, 36, 136.
Dharkaṭṭa, caste, 109.
Dhed, caste, 35, 36.
Dhimār, caste, 36, 37, 38, 41.
Dhobi, caste, 7, 36. *see* Washerman.
Differentiation, 165.
Divide and Rule policy, 199.
Dom, Domb, caste, 4, 7, 32, 89, 105, 122, 124, 136, 247, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253.
prominence at the burning ghat, 25.
Dosadh or Dusadh, 124, 136.
Draupadī, objection against Karna's low birth by, 89.
Dravidian culture, 136.
Dravidian India, 118.
Dravidian languages, 131, 132.
Dravidian type, Dravida type, 127, 128, 130, 131, 133, 159.
Dravidistan, movement for, 233.
Druids, theory and practice of contagion among, 174.
Dublā, caste, nickname-origin of, 33.
Dvija, Dvijāti, 55.
see Twice-born castes.
Dyer of cloths, caste, 97.

E

Egypt, Ptolemaic, 169.
Egyptians, 143, 144 ; and Greeks, 144.
Ekajāti, 55, 175.
Eknāth, performance of purificatory rites by, 104.
Elizabethan Age, 272.
Ellenborough, Lord, on the recruit-

ment of the Indian army, 198.
Elliot, 192.
Elphinston, Lord, on Indian army. 198.
Endogamy, 17, 18, 87, 127 and occupations, 182 ; in Africa, 151 ; in prehistoric Rome, 153 ; among Anglo-Saxons, 136 ; *see* Caste.
Engels, 274, 278, 279.
Español, 150.
Estates-system, 269.
and caste, 211, 270.
Eta, untouchability of, 148, 149.

F

Fick, R. : on the nature of Buddhist revolt, 72 ;
on the endogamy of castes, 87.
Fishermen, caste, 98.
Food : Kachchā, Pakkā, 7, 8 ;
restrictions of, 179, 180.
Forbes, James, on Brahmins of Travancore, 15.
Fryer, John, on the anti-Brahmin attitude of Kammalans, 6.

G

Gachupin, 150.
Gadaria, caste, 32.
Gahapati, 83.
Gaharwal, caste, 110.
Gait, E. A.; on multiplicity of castes, 18, 19.
on prohibition of intermarriage, 21.
Gamalla, caste, 4.
Gandhi, Mahatma : on untouchability, 207, 226 ;
on reinstatement of traditional four castes, 220, 221.
Gaoli, Gauli, Gavli, caste, 31, 35, 36, 40.
Garāsiah, caste, 110.
Gauḍakaraṇika, caste, 109.
Gautama, Dharma Sūtra, 55, 57, 58, 60, 62, 65, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87 ;
on the change of caste, 88.
Gautami, caste, 110.
Ghasi, caste, 107.
Ghelot, caste, 110.
Gola, caste, 125.
Goldsmith, caste, non-Brahmin priests of, 13.
Golla, 125.
Gond, tribe, 32, 36, 106, 129, 138.
Gondhali, caste, sub-castes of, 36.
Gosai caste, sectarian origin of, 33.
Gotra, 96.
Gour, Sir Hari Sing, 188 ;
see Special Marriage Act.
Govallave (cow-herdsmen), caste, 108.
Greeks, 168, 169, 170, 171.
ceremonial purity among, 168.
Gregory XV, Pope, Bull on caste-regulations, 199.
Gretton, on class, 274, 275, 277, 278, 280.
Gṛhya Sūtras, on exclusion of Śūdra from initiation, 61.
Griffin, Sir Lepel, on the usefulness of caste, 199.
Guguli Brahmins, 109.
Guha, Dr. B. S. 132, 139.
Guilds, 153, 157, 158, 159.
Gujar, Gurjar, caste, 32, 36, 110, 128.
Guptas, Imperial, 101.
Gurav, caste, inclusion in the village assembly of, 25.
Guria, caste, 125.
Gwāliā, caste, 110.

H

Haddon, Dr. A. C., 129, 137.
Halwāi, caste, 8.
Hamilton, Capt. Alexander, on divisions among Baniyas, 110.
Hammonds, on class, 272, 284.
Hammurapi, Code of, 144, 145.

Harsha, Harṣhavardhana, 100.
Hāvig Brahmins, pursuit of agriculture by, 16,
Hawaians, three class-divisions among, 151.
Hemachandra, 99, 108.
Hemādri, 43, 101, 102, 103.
Hinin, untouchability of, 148.
Holeya, caste, 6, 11.
Hūṇas, invasion of India by, 102
Hypergamy, 18, 102, 107, 178.

I

Idaiyan, caste, 126.
Idiga, caste, 4.
Ilavas (toddy tappers), caste, 108.
Impure, castes, 10, 11, 15, 19.
things, 179.
Indian army, exclusion of higher castes from, 198.
Indian Mutiny, 16; *see* Mutiny of 1857.
Indo-Aryan culture, 165.
Indo-Aryans, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136, 165, 166.
Indo-Aryan type, 127, 128, 139
Indo-Europeans, 166.
Indo-European peoples, status among, 165.
Initiation, exclusion of Śūdra from, 60, 61.
Intermarriage, 100, 101, 107, 180, 181, 188, 210.
Iranians, 128, 166
Ireland, 153.
Irula, caste, 126, 130, 131.
Irving, B. A., 17.
Islam, impact of, 110.
Izhava (toddy tapper), caste, 12

J

Jackson, 21.
Jainism; Vaiśya followers of, 64.
assertion of Kshatriya's social supremacy by, 69.
Jājali, episode of, 66.
Jalābyabahārya-Śūdra, 8.
Jalāchararaniya-Śūdra, 8.
Janaka, philosopher-king, 49.
Jāṭ, caste, 31.
Jātaka, stories, 70, 71, 81, 83, 84. 87.
Jāti, 55, 76, 96.
Jehangir, castes in time of, 110.
Jñāneśwar, 104
Jogi, caste, 33, 38
Joria, caste, 32
Joyce, T. A., on differential Index, 118.
Justice Party, 232

K

Kachchā, food, 7, 8.
Kadamba, rulers of Banawasi, 110.
Kahār, tribe, 32.
Kaiborat, caste, 125.
Kalhana, 247, 248, 249, 250.
Kali age, 89, 102, 106.
Kallan, tribe, 33.
Kamalākara, Nibandha-writer, 101. 102, 103, 106, 107.
Kambojas, corporation of warriors, occupations of, 83.
Kammalans, caste, opposition to Brahmins of, 6, 213.
see Artisans of Madras
Kamsala, caste, 4.
Kananjia, Brahmins, military services of, 16.
Kandu, caste, 107.
Kanets, caste, 130, 138.
Kanikkar, tribe, 126, 130, 131.
Kanmalar, caste, 109.
Kapadia, Dr. K. M., 231.
Karhāḍā Brahmins, endogamy of, 18, 211.
Karṇa, discipleship of Paraśurāma, 68; low birth of, 89
Karnatak Smarta Brahmin, nasal index, 125.
Kāsār, caste, 32.

Kashmiris, 129.
Kassites, migration from Elain, 138.
Kāṭhaka Samhita : a rite for non-Brahmins, 48 and
Kshatriya's superiority over Brahmins, 49.
Kāṭhi, physical affinity of, 178.
Katia, caste, 36.
Kātkari, tribe, 40, 131.
Kauravas, 88.
Kaushītaki Brāhmaṇa, on Nishādas, 53.
Kauśik, caste, 110.
Kauṭilya, 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 98, 244, 245, 247 ; *see* Arthaśāstra.
Kavasha, low birth of, 48.
Kayams, three classes of, 150.
Kāyasth, caste, 8, 34, 35, 109, 110, 119, 121, 177.
Keane, A. H. on the close correspondence of nose index to social status, 124.
Kentish society, three sub-divisions of, 154.
Kenyakas, three classes of, 150.
Kerr, James, on the usefulness of caste, 199.
Kevaṭṭas, caste, 84.
Khand, caste, 110.
Khandait, caste, 125.
Kharwār, caste, 4.
Khasia, caste, 110.
Khatri, caste, 120, 178.
Khond, tribe, 32.
Kisan, caste, 31.
Koch, Kochh, tribe, 32, 125.
Koiri, caste, 124.
Kol, caste, 124, 129.
Kolhāti, caste, 107.
Koli, caste, 5, 25, 35, 36, 110.
Komṭi, caste, 4, 125.
Konkanastha Brahmins : exemption from duties of, 14 ;
devotion to secular pursuits, 16.
endogamy of, 18, 210
territorial derivation of, 35 ; *see* Chitpavan Brahmins.
Kori, caste, 36.
Korwa, caste, 4.
Koshti, caste, 32, 38, 256.
Krishṇa, preaching of, 66.
Kshatriyas, 17, 19, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 77, 78, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 102, 106, 175, 180, 220, 221, 241.
competition with Brahmins, 67, 68, 69.
dependence on Brahmins, 46, 67.
alleged extinction of, 102.
marriage among, 85-88.
occupation of, 82, 83, 106.
and priestcraft, 48, 67.
revolt against Brahmins, 69.
Kulin Brahmins, 207.
Kulwādi, caste, 19.
Kumbhār, Kumhār, caste, 25, 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41 ; *see* Potter.
Kunbi, caste, 26, 31, 35, 36, 38, 40, 122.
Kurmi, caste, 31, 110, 119, 121, 124, 135.
Kurumba 125 126.

L

Laet, a class in Anglo-Saxon England, 154.
Laghuśaṅka . Smṛti, on distinction between Śūdra and other castes, 94.
on pollution of water, 98.
Laghuvishṇu, Smṛti, on classification of Śūdras, 94.
Laṭṭhe, A. B., on communal electorates, 202.
on non-Brahmin movement, 226, 227.
Leather-workers, caste, 98.
Likhita, Smṛti, on distinction between Śūdra and other castes, 94.
Lingāyat, caste, 12.

Linga — Banajiga, caste, 125.
Lipson, on class,
Lodhā, caste, 31, 124.
Lohānā, caste, ethnic origin of, 32.
Lohār, caste, 26, 32, 35, 124, 195.
inclusion in the village assembly of, 25.
Loṇāri, caste, sub-divisions of, 37.
Lunia, caste, occupational origin of, 32.

M

Macalister, Professor, on Celtic class structure, 153.
Mace, Prof. C. A., 258, 259.
MacIver, R. M., on the distinction between caste and class, 2.
on interests, 280, 282.
on middle class, 280.
Mādhava, commentator on Parāśara-Smṛti, 43, 101, 103, 106, 107.
Mādiga, 4, 10, 125, 137.
Maga Brahmins, 109.
Mahābhārata, 56, 57, 60, 61, 64, 66, 68, 85, 88.
Mahāpātaka (serious sins) 58.
Mahār. caste, 2, 10, 11, 13, 16, 24, 25, 26, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 104, 106, 122, 189, 253.
to determine date of the wedding, 26.
Mahārājā of Kolhapur, advocacy of Non-Brahmin cause by, 191, 201.
Mahāvīra, preachings of, 69.
Mahipati, author of *History of Saints*, 104.
Māla, caste, 4, 125, 137.
Malaiyali, caste, 126.
Malasar, caste, 126.
Māli, caste, 35, 40, 200
Mameluco, 150.
Mānbhāos: sectarian origin of, 33.
revolt against caste, 105.
Mandlik, V. N., on internal economy of Śūdra, 54.
Māng, caste, 11, 24, 25, 38.
Manu, Smṛti, 43, 55, 81, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 98, 99.
Maoris, social orders among, 150.
Marāṭhā, 2, 25, 32, 36, 122, 191.
Marāṭhā rule, 11.
Maravan 262.
Martin, R. M., on the gradations of caste, 6.
Marutta Āvikshita, 52.
Marxian sociology, 276, 277, 279.
Mastan Brahmins, 125.
Matanggali, groups among some Fijians, 151.
Matrilineal descent, 133.
Matthai, Dr. John, on the village panchayat, 24.
Maudgala-Brahmins, mention in an inscription of, 109.
Mediterranean Race, 130.
Megasthenes, 1, 116, 134.
Mehtar, caste, 110.
Meo, caste, 110, 129.
Mestizo, 150.
Metcalfe, Sir Charles, on solidarity of Indian village, 23.
Mexico, 149.
Meyer, Eduard, on Persian intolerance, 167.
Middle class
Middleton, on Government's responsibility for caste propagation, 195.
Minā, caste, 32, 110, 129.
Missionaries, Christian, 207.
Mohammedan, 207.
Mochi, Muchi, caste, 35, 107, 109, 125.
Moḍha, caste, mention in Jain inscription of, 109.
Moger, caste, three sub-divisions of, 40.
Monglo-Dravidian type, 127, 135. 136
Mongoloid, people, 136.
Mongoloid type, 127, 130, 135, 136, 138, 139.
Montague, 191, 201.
Moreland, on castes in Akbar's

time, 110.
Mṛcchakaṭika, 99.
Mulatto, 150.
Müller, Professor Max, on the initiation of Śūdras, 61.
Munda culture, 132, 133.
Munda languages, 133.
Munda people, 32, 132, 133, 135.
Munda type, 132, 133, 135, 136, 138, 139.
Musāhār, tribe, 4, 7, 33, 120, 124, 126, 131, 133.
Muslims, 102, 152.
Mutiny of 1857, 198, 199.
see Indian Mutiny
Myras, caste, 8.

N

Nabaśākh, caste, 8.
Nāgar Brahmins, 35, 108, 109, 122, 137, 178.
Nāi, Nhāvi, caste, 4, 35, 37, 39, 136.
see Barber.
Naikḍā, caste, nickname, origin of, 33.
Nāmadev, Maratha Saint, 104.
"Namas" (obeisance), formula, 93.
Nāmaśudra, 207, 250, 251.
Nāmbudiri Brahmins, 9, 12, 17, 126, 134.
Nārada, Smṛti: on privileges of Brahmins, 91.
on succession to property, 96.
on pure and impure works, 100.
Nasal index, 118, 120, 122, 123, etc.
National unity, Bryce on, 235.
Nāyaka kings, 106.
Nāyakars, Naickers, caste, 10, 16.
caste name, 234.
Nāyar, caste, 9, 17, 32, 126, 130, 134.
Negritos, 132, 138.
Negroes, 150.
Nemakavanika, case, 108.
Nesfield, J. C., 36, 116, 192.
Nhāvi, *see* Nai.
Nibandha writers, 107.
Nīlakaṇṭha, on the caste and Varna of litigants, 107.
Nishāda: partiality of Aryans for, 52, 53.
degradation of, 82.
Non-Brahmins: two divisions of, in Madras, 12, 109.
legal dispute between Brahmins and, 47, 187.
of Madras, 202, 232.
movement, 201, 202, 203, 214, 226, 227, 232.
saints, 104.
scholarships for, 190.
special representation in administration, 190, 202, 203, 204.
representation in services, 202, 205, 206.
anti-Brahmin feeling of, 202, 205
support to Buddha, 72.
Nordics, 138.

O

Oil pressers, caste, 97.
Oraon, caste: ethnic origin of, 32.
prevalence of marriage of grand-father with grand-daughter, 133.
Origins of caste, 107, 183.
Oswāḷa, caste, 35, 109.
Out-castes, 54, 55, 77, 79, 80, 81, 96, 97, 98, 105.
in Japan, 148, 149.
Owen, on upper class, 278.

P

Paes Domingos, on Brahmin traders and cultivators, 110.
Paijavana, munificence of, 60.
Pākayajñas, 60.
Pakhah Rajputs, caste council of, 186.
Pakkā, food, 7, 8.
Pali texts, 83.
Pallans, caste, 10, 255.
Palli, caste, 10.

Pan, caste, 125.
Pañchagavya, 94, 103.
Pānchajanāḥ, 53.
Pānchmas, 10.
see untouchables.
Pañchavimśā Brāhmaṇa: on extreme sanctity of Brahmin, 47.
on capital punishments for Brahmin, 47.
on alleged low birth of Vatsa, 48.
on main duty of Śūdra, 50.
Panchayat (governing body of a caste), 3, 4, 20, 213, 215.
offences tried by, 3, 4.
punishments awarded by, 4.
see Standing Councils of caste.
Pāṇḍavas, 88.
Pāṇḍarpeśe, 19.
Pānini's grammar, 13, 80.
Paniyan, caste, 131.
Pankā, tribe, 33, 40.
Paraiyan, caste, 10, 11, 26, 253.
Parāśara, Smṛti, 43, 101, 102.
Pāraśava brothers, 101.
Paraśurāma, destruction of Kshatriyas by, 63, 68, 102.
Pardhāns, caste, 37, 41.
Pārdhi, caste, 41.
Pariah, caste, 24, 33.
Parsis, 191.
Parvati temple, 194.
Paschatya Vaidika Brahmin, cephalic index of, 122; nasal index of, 122.
Pasi, tribe, 32, 121, 123, 124.
Patañjali, 63, 76, 80, 89, 176.
Patel, V. J., efforts to liberalize marriage law, 188.
Patricians, 171.
Paṭṭanūlkāran, caste, 32.
Pattasalins, caste, 108.
Paṭwā, caste, 32.
Paulkasa, origin of, 53.
Peake, H. J. E., on appearance of Nordics in Asia Minor, 138.
Pear, Prof. T. H., 268, 269.
Peel, Lord, 198.
Persians, 167.
Peshwas, diaries of, 11, 24, 193.
rule of, 11, 12, 13, 14, 99, 106, 213.
Petrie, Sir W. M. Flinders, on social situation in Egypt, 143.
Phooley, Jyotirao, revolt against caste, 200, 201, 207, 258.
Physical characteristics of a Brahmin according to Patañjali, 176.
Plato, 169.
Pocock, D. F., 230.
Pod, caste, 125, 135.
Pollution by touch, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 80, 99, 106, 122, 209, etc.
Polyandry, 21.
Portuguese, 150.
Potter caste, 12, 25, 39, 41, 83.
Prabhu, Kayastha Prabhu: prohibition of drinks, 5.
protest against certain caste restrictions, 213.
right of Vedic ritua's, 13.
Prārthanā Samāj, contrast with Ārya Samāj, 200.
Pratiloma castes, 55.
Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, philosopher-king, 49.
Pre-Dravidian type, 130, 131, 132, 138, 139.
Priesthood, organization for, 237.
Professions, in England, 275.
Proletariat, 181, 276, 277.
Ptolemies, 144.
Pulayan, caste, 9.
Pulkasa, 66.
Purāṇas, 94.
Puranic ritual, 13, 94, 105, 237.
Purusha-sūkta hymn, four orders of society in, 44.
Pyramid age, 143.

R

Rāḍhiya Brahmins, mention in an Orissa inscription, 109.
Raghubansi, sub-division of Rajputs, 110.
Rājā of Satara, diaries of, 21.

Rajabansi Kochh, 125.
Rājaśekhara, Brahmin, marriage with a Chāhamān lady, 101.
Rajput, caste, 3, 34, 110, 124, 128, 129, 138.
Rāma, 59.
Rāmadas, 14.
Rām Mohan Roy, movement to liberalize religion and caste, 199.
Ramāi, 105.
Rāmānanda, establishment of a new sect by, 103.
Rāmānuja, 103;
efforts for betterment of untouchables, 106.
Rāmāyaṇa, 59, 88.
Rāmośi, caste, 33.
Ranade, M. G., sympathy with Phooley, 201.
expiatory rites by, 209.
Rathakāra, high status of, 51.
degradation of, 82.
Recruitment to public services, and caste, 206.
Reḍḍis, caste, 16, 212.
Republic Constitution, on caste, 224.
Reservation of posts in services, 205.
see Non-Brahmins.
Reserved representation, 204.
see Non-Brahmins and Depressed Classes.
Revolts, 283, 284.
Richards, F. J., on sub-caste as unit of Hindu society, 20.
Ṛigveda, 39, 44, 46, 49, 50, 51, 53, 67, 89.
Rising of 1857, 198, 199.
Risley, Sir Herbert, 116, 117, 119, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136, 137, 162.
Roman Church, accommodation of caste in, 199.
Romans, 171, 172, 173.
Rome, social history of, 171.
Roy, S. C. Rai Bahadur, on Oraons, 133.
Ruskin, 278.
Russell, R. V., on traditional occupations of castes, 17.
on sub-caste as basis of Indian society, 20.

S

Sad-gop, caste, 125.
Sādh, caste, 33.
Sahajiya, sect., 105.
Śāgirdapśā, 34.
Saints of Mahārāshtra, 104, 105.
Śaivism, 104.
Śakas, 89.
Sakais, 133.
Salariat, 276, 277, 281.
Sāle, Sāli, caste, 32, 36, 107, 137.
Saliyans, caste, 108.
Saṁhitas, 43.
Samoans, six classes of, 151.
Samurai, privileges of, 148-149.
Saṁvarta, Smṛti, on pollution of water, 98.
Sanādhya Brahmins, 16.
Santal, tribe, 32, 130, 133.
Śantanu, marriage with fisherman's daughter, 88.
Sāraswat Brahmins: divisions of, 19.
territorial derivation of, 34, 35.
Sassanian period, 146, 167, 168.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 45. 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51.
Sat-Śūdra, 8, 92, 93, 102.
Satyakāma, Jābāla, 47.
Satyaśodhaka Samāj, the aims of, 200.
Satyavati, low family of, 88.
Saurāṣhṭras, corporation of warriors occupations of, 83.
Savaras, caste, Mongoloid origin of, 136.
Scandinavia, social classes in, 156.
Scheduled castes, 240 ff.
and Republican Constitution, 224;
provisions governing the cases, 225.
Schoff, Dr., 138.

Schumpeter, 281.
Scytho-Dravidian type, 127, 137.
Segregation of castes, 9, 10, 11.
Semangs, 133.
Shāh Nāmah, 146.
Shaman, caste, 126.
Shānār, caste, 9, 12; temple entry by, 262.
Shashan Brahmins, 125.
Shenvi Brahmins: prohibition of drinks, 5.
Physical affinities, 122, 136: nasal index, 137.
Sherring, M. A., 20, 192.
Shimpi, caste, 37.
Shinde V. R., efforts in the interests of depressed classes, 207.
Shrikant, Shri L. M., report on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes by, 260, 261.
Śiva-Brahmins, 109.
Śivaskandavarman, king of Kanchi, 108.
Smārta Brahmins, 35, 40.
Snātaka, 62.
Social differentiation, 165.
Solaga, caste, 126.
Soma, 57.
Sombart, 287.
Sonār, Soni, 2, 31, 195.
see Goldsmith.
Son koli, Physical affinity of, 122. 178.
Southern peoples, 180.
Spaniards, 149, 150.
Special Marriage Act of 1872, 188.
Special Representation, 202, 203, 204, 205, 226.
Śrāddha-dinner, 82, 99, 104.
Śreshṭhis, their quarter, 96.
Standing Caste-Councils: offences tried by, 3, 4;
punishments awarded by, 4;
loss of importance, 185, 186;
assumption of new duties by, 192, 193, 213.
Status by birth, 165.
Steele, Arthur, 5, 185.
Sub-Castes, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 34, 35, 37, 52, 222.
Sudāsa, 48, 67.
Śūdra, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 24, 44, 45, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 110, 175, 179, 180, 181, 187, 200, 220, 221, 241, 244, 246, 271 ;
sub-castes in Bengal, 8 ;
disqualification for sacrifice and sacraments, 45, 51, 59, 60 ;
duties and occupations, 50, 60, 82, 83, 99, 102 ;
origin, 44 ;
illicit connection between Ārya male and Śūdra female, 51, 54 ;
debarred from initiation. 60;
degradation of, 59, 60, 61, 62, 92. 103 ;
adultery of Śūdra male with Ārya female, 51, 52, 62 ;
Sat, 92, 94, 102 ;
Puranic rites, 94, 105 ;
Pañchagavya, 94, 103 ;
Saints, 104, 105.
Śukranīti: no suitability of "names" formula for Śūdras, 93, 94.
on issue of mixed marriage, 95
Sumerians, 144.
Sumitrā, 63.
Sūta, caste, 55.
Sūtradhār, caste, 108.
Sutār, caste, 2, 25, 32, 35.
Sūtras, 66, 80.
Śyāvāśva, 48.

T

Tachchan, caste, occupational origin of, 32.
Tagore, Devendranath, movements to liberalize religion and caste, 199.
Tahitian Society, divisions of, 151.

Tamilnad Congress Committee, and Caste, 203.
Tamil proverb, ascetics and caste on, 200.
Taittirīya Saṃhitā: origin of four classes in, 44.
greatest ambition of Vaiśya in, 44.
Tāmbat, Caste, occupational origin of, 50.
Tāmboli, caste, 32.
Tāmbūlika, caste, 108
Tamil Brahmins, 126.
Tānti, caste, occupational origin of, 32.
Tarkhan, caste, occupational origin of, 32.
Tawney, R. H., on class, 66, 272, 273. 274.
Teli-Baniyas, caste, 37.
Teli-Kalars, caste, 37.
Telis (oil-pressers), caste, 26, 32, 39. 125.
Teutonic peoples, class structure among, 154.
Thakkar, A. V., services in the case of untouchables, 207.
Tharu tribe, 124.
Thatherā, caste, occupational origin of, 32.
Theodosian code, compulsion to follow hereditary occupation, 153.
Tiyan, caste, 9, 12, 14, 33, 110, 126, 134.
Toda, tribe, 134, 138
Togata, caste, 125.
Toreya, caste, 125.
Trevelyan, on class, 272, 278, 282.
Triplicane fund, 212.
Tukārām, Marāthā Saint, 104.
Turko,-Iranian, type, 127.
Twice-born castes, 6, 55, 61, 95.

U

Untouchables, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 24, 99, 106, 189, 201, 207, 209, 210, 221, 236.
and entry on Vaikam roads, 207.
and orthodox Hindus, 208.
see Depressed Classes.
Untouchability, 10, 53, 99, 105, 182, 189, 207, 208, 221, 237, etc.
disappearance of, 238.
see Pollution by touch.
Upaniṣhads, theorizing of, 71.
Uśanas, Smṛti: on classification of Śūdras, 94.
on movements of Chaṇḍāla in a village, 98.
Ushasti, 242.

V

Vaidya, caste, 35.
Vaiṇa, mixed caste, 65.
Vaishnavism: devotional sects, inferiority of Śūdra in, 104.
spiritual betterment of Śūdra in, 104.
Vaiśya, 44, 45, 50, 54, 55, 56, 58, 63, 64, 65, 77, 78, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 94, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 110, 175, 180, 181, 220, 221, 241, 244.
debarred from kingship, 50.
approximation to Śūdras, 56, 63, 86, 94, 180.
duties and occupations of, 82, 83, 102, 106.
marriage among 85, 88.
Vākāṭaka, dynasty, 101, 285.
Vakkaliga, caste, 31.
Vallave (herdsmen) caste, mention in Prakrit inscription of, 108.
Vāṇi, caste, 2, 31, 35.
Vaṇika, caste, 108.
Varṇa-dharma, 46, 54.
Varṇas, 46, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 63, 66, 76, 77, 79, 90, 91, 100, 106, 107.
Varṇa-Saṅkara (mixture of castes) prevention of, 55.

Vasishṭha, sage, rivalry with Viśvāmitra, 48, 67.
an officiating priest, 63.
Vasishṭha, Dharma Sūtra, 51, 56, 57, 59, 63, 78, 79, 84, 86.
Vatsa, low origin of, 49.
Vedavyāsa, Smṛti, on outcastes, 98.
Vedic ritual, great sanctity of, 13.
Vellāl, Caste, 16, 21, 26, 31, 106.
Vellāḷan, Caste, 108.
Venkayya, on names of individuals in South Indian inscription, 108.
Vidur, caste, 34.
Village-Councils, inclusion of all castes, in 24.
Vishṇu, Smṛti, 43, 91, 94, 97.
Viśvakarmans, caste, 202
Viśvāmitra, rivalry with Vasisṭha, 48, 67.
an officiating priest, 67, 68.
Vṛddhahārita, Smṛti, on pollution by contact, 99.
Vyādha, episode of, 66.

W

Washermen, caste, 10, 79, 89, 97, 98.
importance of, at Kunbi-wedding, 26.
Widow re-marriage, 186.
Widow re-marriage Act, 185.
Working class, 276, 277, 278, 281.
Woolley, C. L., on Sumerian class-system, 145.

Y

Yājñavalkya, Smṛti, 42, 93, 94, 95, 99, 107.
Yajurveda, 47, 52.
Yāska, 48.
Yavanas, 89.

Z

Zarathushtra, 146.
Zweig, on Brazilian class structure, 150.